



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 51]
No. 51]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, दिसम्बर 23, 1989/पौष, 2, 1911
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1989/PAUSA 2, 1911

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than
the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली 21, नवंबर, 1989

का. प्रा. 3177.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियमावली, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रण में स्थित भारतीय खोज बोया निगम के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारीत्व ने हिन्दी का कार्य साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है—

भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम

1. पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय, कार्यालय, बम्बई
2. मण्डल कार्यालय, जोधपुर
3. शाखा कार्यालय, जोधपुर-1
4. शाखा कार्यालय, जोधपुर-2
5. शाखा कार्यालय, जोधपुर-3
6. शाखा कार्यालय, जोधपुर सी. ए.
7. शाखा कार्यालय, भीनमाल
8. शाखा कार्यालय, पाली

9. शाखा कार्यालय, सिरोही
10. शाखा कार्यालय, सुमेरपुर
11. शाखा कार्यालय, बिलाडा
12. शाखा कार्यालय, बालोतरा
13. शाखा कार्यालय, बाड़मेर
14. शाखा कार्यालय, जैसलमेर
15. शाखा कार्यालय, जालोर
16. शाखा कार्यालय, मकराना
17. शाखा कार्यालय, डिडवाना
18. शाखा कार्यालय, मेड़ता सिटी
19. शाखा कार्यालय, मासोर
20. शाखा कार्यालय, बीकानेर-1
21. शाखा कार्यालय, बीकानेर-2

[सं. 13011/7/88-हि.का.क.]
के. जी. शोयल, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Economic Affairs)
New Delhi, the 21st November, 1989
S.O. 3177.—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule
10 of the official language (use for official purposes of

the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby Notifies the following offices of Life Insurance Corporation of India (under the Administrative control of Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs) whereof more than 80 per cent of staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :—

Life Insurance Corporation of India.

1. West Regional Office, Bombay.
2. Divisional Office, Jodhpur.
3. Branch Office, Jodhpur-1.
4. Branch Office, Jodhpur-2.
5. Branch Office, Jodhpur-3.
6. Branch Office, Jodhpur, C.A.B.
7. Branch Office, Bhinmal.
8. Branch Office, Pali.
9. Branch Office, Birohi.
10. Branch Office, Sumerpur.
11. Branch Office, Bilad.
12. Branch Office, Balotara.
13. Branch Office, Badmer.
14. Branch Office, Jaisalmer.
15. Branch Office, Jalour.
16. Branch Office, Makarana.
17. Branch Office, Didwana.
18. Branch Office, Medtacity.
19. Branch Office, Nagoar.
20. Branch Office, Bikaner-1.
21. Branch Office, Bikaner-2.

[No. F. 13011/7/88-HIC]
K. G. GOAL, Director

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 दिसंबर, 1989

का. भा. 3178.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, (अनुसूची बैंक) अधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का 38) की धारा 25 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ड) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा नीचे की सारणी के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उनमें से प्रत्येक के सामने उसी सारणी के कालम (3) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों के स्थान पर सारणी के कालम (1) में दिए गए अनुसूची बैंकों के निवेशक के रूप में नामित करती है :—

सारणी		
1	2	3
1. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ मैसूर	श्री ए. व. प्रसाद, उप सचिव, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) नई दिल्ली।	श्री यशपाल सेठी
2. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंदौर	श्री एन. प्रसाद, उप सचिव, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) नई दिल्ली।	श्री संतोष कुमार

[सं. एफ. 9/6/89-बी. प्रो.-1]

एम. एस. सीतारामन, अवर सचिव

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 1st December, 1989

S.O. 3178.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) sub-section (1) of section 25 of the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Act, 1959 (38 of 1959), the Central Government hereby nominates the persons specified in column (2) of the Table below as Directors of the Subsidiary Banks specified in column (1) thereof in place of the persons specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table.

TABLE

(1)	(2)	(3)
State Bank of Mysore	Shri N. Prasad, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, (Banking Division), New Delhi.	Shri Y.P. Sethi
State Bank of Indore	Shri N. Prasad, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, (Banking Division), New Delhi.	Shri H. Santosh Kumar

[No.F.9/6/89-BO.I]

M.S. SEETHARAMAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली: 6 दिसंबर, 1989

का. भा. 3179.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक वित्त निगम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 15) की धारा 21 की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में भारतीय औद्योगिक वित्त निगम के निवेशक बोर्ड की सिफारिश पर उक्त निगम द्वारा 26 दिसंबर, 1989 को जारी किए जाने वाले और 26 दिसंबर, 2009 को परिपक्व होने वाले बांडों पर वार्षिक व्याज की दर एतद्वारा 11.5% (साढ़े पारह प्रतिशत) वार्षिक निर्धारित करती है।

[का. सं. 2/20/आर्थ.एफ. 1/89]

वी. पी. भारद्वाज, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th December, 1989

S.O. 3179.—In pursuance of sub-section 2 of Section 21 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948 (15 of 1948), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India, hereby fixes 11.5 per cent (Eleven & half per cent) per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds to be issued by the said Corporation on 26th December, 1989 and maturing on 26th December, 2009.

[F. No. 2(20)/IF-1/89]

V. P. BHARDWAJ, Under Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

आर्थिक आयोजना और ऋण विभाग

(केन्द्रीय कार्यालय)

बम्बई, 28 नवम्बर, 1989

का. भा. 3180.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का अधिनियम सं. 2) की धारा 42 की उपधारा (7) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक एतद्वारा प्रत्येक राज्य सहकारी बैंक को, जिसे क्रिषिहाल उपर्युक्त अधिनियम की दूसरी अनुसूची में शामिल किया गया है,

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 की धारा 42 की उप धारा (1) के परंतुक से 31 दिसम्बर, 1990 तक की प्रतिरिक्त अधिध के लिए उस सीमा तक छूट देता है जहां तक कि उसके अंतर्गत जारी की गई किसी भी अधिसूचना के साथ पठित उक्त परंतुक की अपेक्षानुसार कोई अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक धारा 42 की उप धारा (1) में संश्लिप्त उक्त बैंक की मूल सार्वधि और मांग वेतनाओं के 3 प्रतिशत से अधिक प्रीसत दैनिक शेष बनाये रखता है।

[आर पी सी डी स. आर एफ. 383/ए.20(24)-89/90]
यू. के. शर्मा, कार्यपालक निदेशक

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

(Rural Planning and Credit Department)

(Central Office)

Bombay, the 28th November, 1989

S.O. 3180.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (7) of Section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India, Act, 1934 (Act No. 2 of 1934), the Reserve Bank of India hereby exempts every State Cooperative Bank which is for the time being included in the Second Schedule to the said Act from the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 in so far as that proviso read with any notification issued thereunder requires a scheduled state cooperative bank to maintain an average daily balance in excess of 3 per cent of the net time and demand liabilities of the bank referred to in sub-section (1) of Section 42 for a further period upto 31 December 1990.

[RPCD No. RF. 383/A.20(24)-89/90]

U. K. SARMA, Executive Director

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(मुख्य निर्यात, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 4 दिसम्बर, 1989

का. आ. 3181.—नैसर्ग आटो टेंशन लिमिटेड, नई दिल्ली को मुक्त विदेशी मशीन के अंतर्गत रिपन लॉडिंग टेस्टिंग मशीन के आयात के लिए 9,67,900 रु. (नौ लाख सत्तर हजार नौ सौ रुपये मात्र) के लिए एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/सी.जी./2124845/सी/XX/11/एच/88/सी.जी.-1/एल.एस. दिनांक 9-3-89 दिया गया था।

क्रम ने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आदेश दिया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति उनसे खो अथवा गम हो गई है। धारा यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति सीमा शुल्क अधिकारी, इंदिरा गांधी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विमान पत्तन नई दिल्ली के पास पंजीकृत थी तथा 82,170 रुपये के लिए सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के मूल्य का उपयोग किया गया है तथा उस पर 8,85,730 रुपये मूल्य का उपयोग करना शेष है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में लाइसेंसधारी ने मोटोरी पब्लिक, नई दिल्ली के मंगल विधिवत् गण्य लेकर एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। तबनुसार मे संतुष्ट है कि आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/सी.जी./2124845 दिनांक 9-3-89 की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति क्रम से खो अथवा गम हो गई है।

7-12-1955 के यथा संशोधित आयात (निर्यात) आदेश 1955 के उपखंड 9(ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नैसर्ग आटो टेंशन लिमिटेड को जारी उक्त मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति सं. पी/सी.जी./2124845 दिनांक 9-3-89 को एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3. 8,85,730- रुपये के लिए उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति क्रम को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं. सी.जी.-1/1081/7/88-89/478]

सी. आर. अहिर, उप मुख्य निर्यात, आयात निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 4th December, 1989

S.O. 3181.—M/s. Auto Tension Ltd., New Delhi were granted an import licence No. P.CG|2124845|C|XX|11|H|88|CG.I|LS dated 9-3-89 for Rs. 9,67,900 (Rupees Nine Lakhs Sixty-Seven Thousand & Nine Hundred only) for import of Spring loading testing machines under Free Foreign Exchange.

2. The firm has applied for issue of Duplicate copy of Customs purpose copy of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes copy of the licence has been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs Purposes copy of the licence has been registered with the Customs Authority at I.G.I.A. Complex, New Delhi and the value of Customs Purpose copy has been utilised for Rs. 82,170/- leaving a balance of Rs. 8,85,730.

3. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public Delhi. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of import licence No. P|CG|2124845 dated 9-3-89 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs Purposes copy No. P|CG|2124845 dated 9-3-89 issued to M/s. Auto Tension Ltd., is hereby cancelled.

4. A duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued to the party separately for Rs. 8,85,730.

[No. CG.I|1081|7|88-89|478]

B. R. AHIR, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

उद्योग मंत्रालय

(रसायन और पेट्रोसायन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 दिसम्बर, 1989

का. आ. 3182:—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि, लोक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य में गांव गन्धार (विवाजी नगर) तहसील पनवेल जिला रायगढ़ से गांव वेणसे तहसील पण जिला रायगढ़ तक पेट्रोलियम तेल अथवा नैसर्गिक गैस अथवा एल्यूजेंट अथवा अन्य खनिज पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए, पाईप लाई

इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस क्रैकर कॉम्प्लेक्स, विभाग, बिलेपार्ले (प.) मुंबई, द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और अतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय

एतद्वारा जोषित किया है। अतः कि उक्त भूमि में हितवश कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाईन बिछाने के लिए आशेष, सक्षम अधिकारी, इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस क्रैकर कॉम्प्लेक्स, नगोठणे, तहसील रोहा, जिला रायगढ़ को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आशेष करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विशिष्ट व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारी का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 3 की उपधारा 1 अधिसूचना क्रमांक तारीख की अनुसूची

अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नं.	गाटा सं.	क्षेत्र
							हे० आर०
	गव्हाण	पनवेल	रायगढ़	278	3 पै	—	0-12.6
				278	6 पै	—	0-04.0
				287	1 पै	—	0-02.0
				277	1 पै	—	0-00.7
				277	2 पै	—	0-10.3
				277	3 पै	—	0-00.1
				277	4 पै	—	—
				274	10 पै	—	0-21-03
				274	11 पै	—	0-19-4
				274	8 पै	—	0-01-7
				266	4 पै	—	0-13-1
				266	1 पै	—	0-10-6
				267	7 पै	—	0-02-7
				267	8 पै	—	0-13-6
				267	1 ब पै	—	0-01-2
				267	2 पै	—	0-21-2
				267	3 पै	—	0-00-5
				363	1 पै	—	0-06-0

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी.सी.-3]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals) New Delhi, the 1st December, 1989

S.O. 3182.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum, oil, natural gas, effluent or any mineral from village Gavhan (Shiwagi Nagar), Tehsil Panvel District Raigad to village Bendse Tehsil Pen District Raigad in the State of Maharashtra, pipelines should be laid through the agency of Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex, Division Vile Parle (W), Bombay.

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the lands described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby notify their intention to acquire the right of user in the lands referred to in the schedule;

Any person interested in the said lands having any objection for laying the pipelines through the said lands may prefer an objection within 21 days from the date of the notification, to the Competent Authority, Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex Division, Nagothane, Tahsil Roha, District Raigad.

And every person making such an objection shall state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Schedule to Notification under Section 3(1) of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines
(Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962.

Private land

Sl. No.	Name of Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. R.
1.	Gavan	Panvel	Raigad	278	3(P)	..	0-12.6
				278	6 (P)	..	0-04.0
				287	1 (P)	..	0-02.0
				277	1 (P)	..	0-00.7
				277	2 (P)	..	0-10.3
				277	3 (P)	..	0-09.1
				277	4 (P)	..	—
				274	10 (P)	..	0-21.3
				274	11 (P)	..	0-19.4
				274	8 (P)	..	0-01.7
				266	4 (P)	..	0-13.1
				266	1 (P)	..	0-10.6
				267	7 (p)	..	0-02.7
				267	8 (P)	..	0-13-6
				267	1B(P)	..	0-01.2
				267	2 (P)	..	0-21.2
				267	3 (P)	..	0-00.5
				363	1 (P)	..	0-06.0

[No. 34027/1/87-PC.III]

का. आ. 3183 :—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य में गांव मापगांव तहसील अलीबाग जिला रायगड से गांव बोरोस तहसील अलीबाग जिला रायगड तक पेट्रोलियम तेल अथवा नैसर्गिक गैस अथवा एप्लुअंट अथवा अन्य खनिज पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए पाईप लाईन, इंडियन पेट्रो केमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस फ़ेकर कॉम्पलेक्स विभाग, विलेपार (प.) मुंबई, द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और अतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा 1 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है। बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाईन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस फ़ेकर कॉम्पलेक्स, नागोणा तहसील रोहा, जिला रायगड को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करनेवाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि, उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 3 की उपधारा 1 अधिसूचना क्रमांक तारीख की अनुसूची

अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	मार्ग नंबर	हिस्सा नं.	गाटा नं.	क्षेत्र
							हे. आर.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	मापगांव	अलीबाग	रायगड	85	1 पे	—	0-05.0
2.	सोगांव	अलीबाग	रायगड	63	5 + 7 + 8 9—10	—	0-10.1
3.	15	3 पे 1 अ 2 पे	—	0-01.5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. बोरीस		अलिबाग	रायगड	69	5 पै	—	0-09-0
				58	5 अ पै	—	0-00-5
				58	5 ब पै	—	0-02-5
				58	5 क पै	—	0-10-0
				59	2+3 ब पै	—	0-00-5

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी.सी.-3]

S.O. 3183.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum, oil, natural gas, effluent or any mineral from village Mapgaon Tahsil Alibag District Raigad to village Boris Tahsil Alibag District Raigad in the State of Maharashtra, Pipelines should be laid through the agency of Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex Division Vile Parle (W), Bombay;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the lands described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby notify their intention to acquire the right of user in the lands referred to in the schedule;

Any person interested in the said lands having any objection for laying the pipelines through the said lands may prefer an objection within 21 days from the date of the notification, to the Competent Authority, Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex Division, Nagthane, Tahsil Roha, District Raigad.

And every person making such an objection shall state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Schedule to Notification under Section 3(1) of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in Land) Act, 1962

Sl. No.	Name of Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H .R.
1.	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	85	1	—	0-05-0
2.	Sogaon	Alibag	Raigad	63	5+7+8+ 9+10	—	0-10-1
3.	„	„	„	15	3 1A2	—	0-01-5
4.	Boris	Alibag	Raigad	69	5	—	0-09-0
				58	5A	—	0-00-5
				58	5B	—	0-02-5
				58	5C	—	0-10-0
				59	2 3B	—	0-00-5

[No. 34027/1/87-PC.III]

का.आ. 3184. :—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि, लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य में गांव रेणसे तहसील पेण जिना रायगड से गांव आगरसुरे तहसील अलिबाग जिला रायगड तक पेट्रोलियम तेल अथवा नैसर्गिक गैस अथवा एल्युमिनियम अथवा अन्य खनिज पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए, पाईप लाईन, इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस क्रैकर कॉम्प्लेक्स विभाग, विले पार्ले (प.) मुंबई, द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और अतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलेियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 1 की उपधारा 1 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार ने उनमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है। बताने कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आयोग सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, महाराष्ट्र गैस क्रेशर कॉम्प्लेक्स, नागोठणा तहसील रोहा, जिला रायगड को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि, उसकी सुनवाई व्यवस्था हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

पेट्रोलेियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 3 की उपधारा 1 अधिसूचना क्रमांक.....तारीख..... की अनुसूची।

अ. नं.	भूमि का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नं.	गाटा सं.	क्षेत्र हे. आर.
4. आटिबली	पेण	रायगड		15	5 पै	—	0-00-2
आटिबली	"	"		19	1 ब पै	—	0-00-5
5. गांधे	पेण	रायगड		24	4 पै	—	0-01-8
				17	4 पै	—	0-00-5
				16	3 पै	—	0-03-0
				33 ब	— पै	—	0-01-0
6. चोले	पेण	रायगड		14	1 क पै	—	0-00-5
				11	4 पै	—	0-02-0
8. सांबरी	अलिबाग	रायगड		42	1 ब पै	—	0-00-4
				18	— पै	—	0-01-0
9. नवखार तर्फ श्री गांव				36	2-पै	—	0-00-5
11. फणसापुर	अलिबाग	रायगड		9	1-पै	—	0-09.1
				9	3-पै	—	0-01.5
				7	3-पै	—	0-10.0
12. कुर्बुस	अलिबाग	रायगड		24 ब	— पै	—	0-01-3
16. पिटकिरी	अलिबाग	रायगड		62	1 अ पै	—	0-00-2
				64	3 ब 2 पै	—	0-03-7
					1		
				64	3 ब 2 पै	—	0-04.5
					2		
18. खातविरा	अलिबाग	रायगड		8	3 पै	—	0-11-0
				16	1 पै	—	0-03-2
				4	1 पै	—	0-02-0
				15	6 पै	—	0-00-5
				16	2+2 पै	—	0-01-7
					1 1		
				8	1 पै	—	0-00.3
19. कालवड	अलिबाग	रायगड		43	0 पै	—	0-00.6
26. चरी	अलिबाग	रायगड		7	8 पै	—	0-01-0
28. वाघोली	अलिबाग	रायगड		35	1 पै	—	0-05-5
33. भितराई	अलिबाग	रायगड		20	1+2 पै	—	0-00.75
35. मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड		71	1 पै	—	0-06.0
36. मुणेत	अलिबाग	रायगड		24	3 पै	—	0-05.0

S.O. 3184.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum, oil, natural gas, effluent or any mineral from (i) village Bense Tahsil, Pen District Raigad to village Agarsure Tahsil Alibag District Raigad, in the State of Maharashtra, Pipelines should be laid through the agency of Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex Division Vile Parle (W), Bombay;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipelines it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the lands described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby notify their intention to acquire the right of user in the lands referred to in the schedule;

Any person interested in the said lands having any objection for laying the pipelines through the said lands may prefer an objection within 21 days from the date of the notification, to the Competent Authority, Indian Petrochemicals Corporation Limited, Maharashtra Gas Cracker Complex Division, Nagothane, Tahsil Roha, District Raigad.

And every person making such an objection shall state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULES

Schedule To Notification under Section 3(1) of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962

Sl. No.	Name of Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area	
							H	R.
4	Atiwali	Pen	Raigad	15	5 (P)	—	0-00-2	
	"	"	"	19	1B(P)	—	0-00-5	
5	Gandhe	Pen	Raigad	24	4 (P)	—	0-01-8	
				17	4 (P)	—	0-00-5	
				16	3 (P)	—	0-03-0	
				33	—(P)	—	0-01-0	
6	Chole	Pen	Raigad	14	1-C(P)	—	0-00-5	
				11	4 P	—	0-02-0	
8	Sambari	Alibag	Raigad	42	1-B(P)	—	0-00-4	
	"	"	"	18	—(P)	—	0-01-0	
9	Navkhar Tarf Shrigaon.	Alibag	Raigad	36	2(P)	—	0-00-5	
11	Phansapur	Alibag	Raigad	9	1 (P)	—	0-09-1	
	"	"	"	9	3 (P)	—	0-01-5	
	"	"	"	7	3 (P)	—	0-10-0	
12	Kurdus	Alibag	Raigad	24B	—(P)	—	0-01-3	
16	Pitkiri	Alibag	Raigad	62	1A (P)	—	0-00-2	
				64	3B2 (P)	—	0-03-7	
					1			
				64	3/B2 (P)	—	0-04-5	
					2			
18	Khatveera	Alibag	Raigad	8	3 (P)	—	0-11-0	
	"	"	"	16	1 (P)	—	0-03-2	
	"	"	"	4	1 (P)	—	0-02-0	
	"	"	"	15	6 (P)	—	0-00-5	
	"	"	"	16	2	2	0-01-0	
					— + — (P)			
					1 2			
				8	1	—	0-00-3	
19	Kalwad	Alibag	Raigad	43	—(P)	—	0-00-6	
26	Chari	Alibag	Raigad	7	8 (P)	—	0-01-0	
28	Wagholi	Alibag	Raigad	30	1	—	0-05-5	
33	Bhisrai	Alibag	Raigad	20	1 2(P)	—	0-00-75	
35	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	71	1 (P)	—	0-06-0	
36	Mushet	Alibag	Raigad	24	3 (P)	—	0-05-0	

शुद्धि-पत्र

का. आ. 3185.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 में 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार को अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1221 तारीख अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1654 में 1659 में प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छे हैं। इसमें वक्कह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना :

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन

प्रसारित होने का वर्णन

अ.न.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.न	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र
							हे. आर.								हे. आर.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16 17 18
1.	कामार्ले	अलिबाग	रायगड	136	3 पै.	—	0-05.0	1.	कामार्ले	अलिबाग	रायगड	136	3व पै.	—	0-5.0
2.	"	"	"	135	0 पै.	—	0-12.6	2.	"	"	"	135	3अ पै.	—	0-4.3
								3.	"	"	"	135	1व पै.	—	0-5.6
3.	"	"	"	137	7 पै.	—	0-08.0	4.	"	"	"	37	7 पै.	—	0-09.7
4.	"	"	"	137	6 पै.	—	0-03.5	5.	"	"	"	137	6 पै.	—	0-4.5
5.	"	"	"	138	2 पै.	—	0-06.3	6.	"	"	"	138	2 पै.	—	0-3.8
6.	"	"	"	138	4 पै.	—	0-06.0	7.	"	"	"	138	6 पै.	—	0-8.6
7.	"	"	"	71	—	—	0-01.0	8.	"	"	"	—	कम किया	—	—

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी. सी. III]

S.O. 3185.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 1221 dt. 4-4-1988 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1654 to 1659 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tehsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tehsil	Disst.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Kamarle	Alibag	Raigad	136	3 (p)	—	0-05-0	1	Kamarle	Alibag	Raigad	136	3B(p)	—	0-05-0
2	"	"	"	135	—(p)	—	0-12-6	2	"	"	"	135	1A(p)	—	0-04-3
												135	1B(p)	—	0-05-6
3	"	"	"	137	7(p)	—	0-08-0	3	"	"	"	137	7 (p)	—	0-9-7
4	"	"	"	137	6 (p)	—	0-03-5	4	"	"	"	137	6 (p)	—	0-4-5
5	"	"	"	138	2 (p)	—	0-06-3	5	"	"	"	138	2 (p)	—	0-3-8
5	"	"	"	138	4 (p)	—	0-06-0	6	"	"	"	138	6 (p)	—	0-8-6
7	"	"	"	71	(p)	—	0-01-0	7	"	"	"	Deleted			

[No. 34027/1/87-PC : III]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का. आ. 3186.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिवृत्ति नं. का आ. 1221 तारीख अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता. 16 अप्रैल, पृष्ठ 1654 से 1659 प्रसारित हुए अधिवृत्ति की अनुसूची में छे हैं। इनके वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना :

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन									प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	हे. आर.	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्रफल	हे. आर.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	भायमला	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	32	1 पै.	—	0-33.8	1.	भायमला	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	32	1 क पै.	—	0-29.3		
2.								2.	"	"	"	32	1 ब पै.	—	0-4.5		
3.	"	"	"	10	2 पै.	—	0-18.4	3.	"	"	"	10	2 अ पै.	—	0-18.4		
4.	"	"	"	12	0 पै.	—	0-18.9	4.	"	"	"	12	3-5 पै.	—	0-15.4		
5.	"	"	"	12	0 प.	—	0-31.6	5.	"	"	"	12	4 पै.	—	0-31.6		
6.	"	"	"	12	0 पै.	—	0-17.7	6.	"	"	"	12	7 पै.	—	0-17.7		

[सं. 34027/1/87 पी सी III]

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 3186 —Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 1221 Dated 4-4-88 published in the Gazette of India part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1654 to 1659 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1	Bhaiwala	Alibag	Raigad	32	1 (p)	—	0-33-8	1	Bhaiwala	Alibag	Raigad	32	1-c(p)	—	0 29-3
								2	"	"	"	32	1-B(p)	—	0-4-5
2	"	"	"	10	2 (p)	—	0-18-4	3	"	"	"	10	2A(p)	—	0-18-9
3	"	"	"	12	0 (p)	—	0-18-0	4	"	"	"	12	3-5 (p)	—	0-15-4
4	"	"	"	12	0 (p)	—	0-31-6	5	"	"	"	12	4 (p)	—	0-31-6
5	"	"	"	12	0 (p)	—	0-17-7	6	"	"	"	12	7 (p)	—	0-17-7

[No. 34027/1/87-PC III]

का. आ. 3187.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1221 तारीख अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता. 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1654 से 1659 में प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इसमें वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना *

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन										प्रसारित होने का वर्णन													
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	ज़िला	म.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	ज़िला	म.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र								
										हे. आर.												हे. आर.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18						
1.	तलवडे	अलिबाग	रायगड	155	4 पै.	—	0-70.0	1.	तलवडे	अलिबाग	रायगड	155	4अ पै.	—	0-07.0								
2.	"	"	"	57	7 पै.	—	0-07.0	2.	"	"	"	57	7अ पै. 7ब	—	0-07.0								
3.	"	"	डू	80	2 पै.	—	0-08.3	3.	"	"	"	80	2अ + 2ब पै. 1	—	0-08.3								
4.	"	"	"	80	2 पै.	—	0-05.0	4.	"	"	"	80	2अ + 2ब पै. 2	—	0-05.0								
5.	"	"	"	85	0 पै.	—	0-42.1	5.	"	"	"	85	अ पै.	—	0-42.1								

[मं. 34027/1/87-पी. मां. III]

S.O. 3187—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 1221 Dated 4-4-88 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1654 to 1659 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Name of the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area	S. No.	Name of the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18			
							H. Ars.								H. Ars.			
1	Talwade	Alibag	Raigad	155	4 (p)	—	0-07-0	1	Talwade	Alibag	Raigad	155	4A(p)	—	0-07-0			
2	"	"	"	57	7 (p)	—	0-07-0	2	"	"	"	57	7A 7B (p)	—	0-07-0			
3	"	"	"	80	2(p)	—	0-08-3	3	"	"	"	80	2A + 2B 1(p)	—	0-08-3			
4	"	"	"	80	2(p)	—	0-05-0	4	"	"	"	80	2A + 2B 2(p)	—	0-05-0			
5	"	"	"	85	0 (p)	—	0-42-1	5	"	"	"	85	A (p)	—	0-42-1			

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

का. आ. 3188.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1221 तारीख 3 अप्रैल 1983 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3(ii) ता. 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1654 से 1659 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इनमें वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना ।।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन							सारित होने का वर्णन										
अ.न.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गटनं.	क्षेत्र		
							हे. आर.								हे. आर.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	परहूर	अलिबाग	रायगड	31	1ब पै.	—	0-07.0	1.	परहूर	अलिबाग	रायगड	31	1ब3पै	—	0-07.0		
2.	"	"	"	31	4 पै.	—	0-06.8	2.	"	"	"	31	4अ पै.	—	0-06.8		
3.	"	"	"	32	12 पै.	—	0-03.5	3.	"	"	"	32	8 12 पै.	—	0-03.5		
4.	"	"	"	57	0 पै.	—	0-07.5	4.	"	"	"	57	4 पै.	—	0-05.3		
5.	"	"	"					5.	"	"	"	57	3ब पै.	—	0-02.2		
6.	"	"	"	58	1ब पै.	—	0-03.7	6.	"	"	"	58	1ब 1पै.	—	0-03.7		
	"	"	"	58	1क पै.	—	0-15.9	7.	"	"	"	58	1ब2 पै.	—	0-15.9		
7.	"	"	"	70	2 पै.	—	0-13.4	8.	"	"	"	70	2 अ पै.	—	0-02.5		
								9.	"	"	"	70	2ब पै.	—	0-09.9		
								10.	"	"	"	70	1 पै.	—	0-01.0		

[सं. 34027/1/87-पो. सी. III]

S. O. 3188.—Read words and figures shown in column in 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India ; Notification No. S.O. 1221 Dated 4-4-88 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1654 to 1659 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

S. Name of No. the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area	S. Name of the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area				
						H. Ars.							H. Ars				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	Parhoor	Alibag	Raigad	31	1B(p)	—	0-07-0	1	parhoor	Alibag	Raigad	31	1B-3(p)	—	—	0-07-0	
2.	"	"	"	31	4 (p)	—	0-06-8	2	"	"	"	31	4A (p)	—	—	0-06-8	
3.	"	"	"	32	12(p)	—	0-03-5	3	"	"	"	32	4 (p)	—	—	0-03-5	
4	"	"	"	57	0(p)	—	0-07-5	4 5	"	"	"	57	3B (p)	—	—	0-05-3	
5	"	"	"	58	1B(p)	—	0-03-7	6	"	"	"	57	1B	—	—	0-02-2	
												58				0-03-7	
6	"	"	"	58	1C(p)	—	0-15-9	7	"	"	"	58	1 (p)				
													1B 2	—	—	0-15-9	
7	"	"	"	70	2 (p)	—	0-13-4	8	"	"	"	70	1 (p)				
								9	"	"	"	70	2A (p)	—	—	0-02-5	
								10	"	"	"	70	2B (p)	—	—	0-09-0	
												70	1 (p)	—	—	0-01-0	

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

का. आ. 3189.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 में 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1221 तारीख अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता. 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1654 में 1657 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इसमें वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 में 18 लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ता*

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	म.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	म.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	
हे. आर.								हे. आर.								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	89	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	भिसराई	अलिबाग	रायगड	20	5 पै.	—	0-00.5	1.	भिसराई	अलिबाग	रायगड	20	5 पै.	—	0-01.5	
2.	"	"	"	21	3 पै.	—	0-00.2	2.	"	"	"	21	3 पै.	—	0-08.0	
3.	"	"	"	22	1 पै.	—	0-34.4	3.	"	"	"	22	1 पै.	—	0-21.0	
4.	"	"	"	23	2 पै.	—	0-20.7	4.	"	"	"	23	2अ पै.	—	0-17.5	
5.								5.	"	"	"	23	2ब पै.	—	0-05.0	
6.	"	"	"	26	1 पै.	—	0-11.3	6.	"	"	"	26	1अ पै.	—	0-11.33	
7.	"	"	"	30	2 पै.	—	0-02.0	7.	"	"	"	कम किया				
8.	"	"	"	27	4 पै.	—	0-01.0	8.	"	"	"	27	2 3 4—		0-01.0	
9.	"	"	"	30	5 पै.	—	0-17.7	9.	"	"	"	30	5अ पै.	—	0-09.0	
								10.	"	"	"	30	5अ पै.	—	0-08.7	
11.	"	"	"	30	3 पै.	—	0-15.1	11.	"	"	"	30	3अ पै.	—	0-15.1	
												30	3ब			
12.	"	"	"	31	1अपै.	—	0-10.1	12.	"	"	"	32	1अ पै.	—	0-10.1	

S.O. 3189.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. SO. 1221 Dated 4-4-88 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1654 to 1659 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the scheule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. Name of No. the village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars	S. No.	Name of Village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	11	12	13	13	14	15	16	17 18
1 Bhisrai	Alibag	Raigad	20	5 (P)	---	0-00-5	1	Bhisrai	Alibag	Raigad	20	5 (p)	---	0-01-5	
			21	3 (p)	---	0-00-2	2				21	3 (p)	0-08-0		
			22	1 (p)		0-34-4	3				22	1 (p)	0-21-0		
			23	2 (p)		0-20-7	4				23	2A(p)	0-17-5		
							5				23	2B(p)	0-05-0		
			26	1(p)		0-11-3	6				26	1A(p)	0-11-3		
			30	2 (p)		0-02-0	7				Deleted				
			27	4 (p)		0-01-0	8				27	2+3+4	0-01-0		
			30	5 (P)		0-17-7	9				30	5A (p)	0-09-0		
							10				30	5B (p)	0-08-7		
			30	3 (p)		0-15-1	11				30	3A			
							12				30	3B(p)	0-15-1		
			31	1A(p)		0-10-1	13				32	1A(P)	0-10-1		

[No. 34027/1/87-pC-III]

का. आ. 3190.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 1221 तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता. 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1654 से 1659 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन							प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ.न.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.न.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र
							हे. आर.								हे. आर.
1.	बहिरोले	अलिबाग	रायगड	54	0 पै.	—	0-06-3	1. बहिरोले	अलिबाग	रायगड	54	1 पै.	—	0-06-3	
2.	”	”	”	53	5 पै.	—	0-02-0	2. ”	”	”	53	5अ पै.	—	0-02-0	
3.	”	”	”	39	4 पै.	—	0-06-3	3. ”	”	”	39	4 पै.	—	0-06-5	
								4. ”	”	”	39	5 पै.	—	0-00-3	

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी. सी. III]

S.O. 3199—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 1221 dated 4-4-88 Published in the Gazette of India Part II Sec. 3 Sub-Sec. (ii) dated 16-4-88 on Pages 1654 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tehsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area	S. No.	Name of the village	Tahsil	Distt.	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area
							H. Ars.								H. Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Bahirole	Alibag	Raigad	54	0 (P)		0-06-3	1.	Bahirole	Alibag	Raigad	54	1(P)		0-06-3
2.	"	"	"	53	5 (P)		0-02-0	2.	"	"	"	53	5A(P)		0- 02-0
3.	"	"	"	39	4 (P)		0-06-8	3.	"	"	"	39	4 (P)		0- (6-5
								4.	"	"	"	39	5 (P)		0- (6-3

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

का. आ. 3191.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्द और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 514 तारीख 2 फरवरी, 88 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II, खंड 3 (ii) ता. 12 मार्च, 1988 पृष्ठ 621 से 622 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इस वजह से निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्द और संख्या पढ़ना।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन									प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	म.नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स. नं.	हि.नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र		
							हे. आर.								हे. आर.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	वाघोली	अलिबाग	रायगड	36	2 पै	—	0-15.6	1.	वाघोली	अलिबाग	रायगड	कम किया	—				
2.	"	"	"	36	2 पै	—	0-14.9	2.	"	"	"	35	2/1 पै	—		0-31.0	
3.	"	"	"	22	0 पै	—	0-19.2	3.	"	"	"	22	1 पै	—		0-19.2	
4.	"	"	"	17	1 पै	—	0-00.5	4.	"	"	"	17	0 पै	—		0-00.5	
5.	"	"	"	13	0 पै	—	0-10.1	5.	"	"	"	13 अ	0 पै	—		0-23.7	
6.	"	"	"	13	0 पै	—	0-13.6										
7.	"	"	"	9	0 पै	—	0-16.9	6.	"	"	"	9 अ	0 पै	—		0-16.9	
8.	"	"	"	36	1 पै	—	0-06.0	7.	"	"	"	कम किया					

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी. सी. III]

S.O. 3191.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 514 dated 2-2-88. Published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 12-3-88 on pages 621 to 622 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Wagholi	Alibag	Raigad	36	2(P)	—	0-15-6	1.	Wagholi	Alibag	Raigad	Deleted			
2.	"	"	"	35	2(P)	—	0-14-9	2.	"	"	"	35	2/1(P)	—	0-31-0
3.	"	"	"	22	0(P)	—	0-19-2	3.	"	"	"	22	1(P)	—	0-19-2
4.	"	"	"	17	1(P)	—	0-00-5	4.	"	"	"	17	0(P)	—	0-00-5
5.	"	"	"	13	0(P)	—	0-10-1	5.	"	"	"	13A	0(P)	—	0-23-7
6.	"	"	"	13	0(P)	—	0-13-6								
7.	"	"	"	9	0(P)	—	0-16-9	6.	"	"	"	9A	0(P)	—	0-16-9
8.	"	"	"	36	1(P)	—	0-06-0	7.	"	"	"	Deleted			

[No. 34027/1/87-PC. III]

शुद्धि - पत्र

का. आ. 3192—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1218 तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) तारीख 16 अप्रैल, 1988 पृष्ठ 1640 से 1642 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना को अनुसूची में छपे है। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना*

प्रसारित किया गया वर्धन								प्रसारित होने का वर्धन									
अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र		
							हे. आर								हे. आर		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	सोगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	58	2 पै	-	0-10.1	1.	सोगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	58	2अ पै	-	0-10.1		
												58	2ब				
2.	"	"	"	58	1 पै	-	0-07.5	2.	"	"	"	58	1 पै	-	0-10-0		
3.	"	"	"	57	0 पै	-	0-26.5	3.	"	"	"	57	1 पै	-	0-26-5		
4.	"	"	"	63	10 पै	-	0-09.1	4.	"	"	"	कम	किया				
5.	"	"	"	63	11 पै	-	0-07.1	5.	"	"	"	63	11 पै	-	0-04.0		
6.	"	"	"	70	8 पै	-	0-12.6	6.	"	"	"	70	8 पै	-	0-21.0		
7.	"	"	"	70	11 पै	-	0-03.0	7.	"	"	"	70	11 पै	-	0-00.2		
8.	"	"	"	69	7 पै	-	0-07.5	8.	"	"	"	69	7अ पै	-	0-01.7		
9.	"	"	"	69	6 पै	-	0-08.5	9.	"	"	"	69	6 पै	-	0-10.5		
10.	"	"	"	8	1 पै	-	0-16.9	10.	"	"	"	8	1 पै	-	0-21.0		
11.	"	"	"	8	2 पै	-	0-07.5	11.	"	"	"	8	2 पै	-	0.01-0		
12.	"	"	"	15	4 पै	-	0-07.3	12.	"	"	"	15	4 पै	-	0-02.5		
13.	"	"	"	15	1 पै	अ	0-05.0	13.	"	"	"	15	1ब पै	-	0-08.0		
14.	"	"	"	15	2 पै	-	0-29.5	14.	"	"	"	15	2 पै	-	0-25.0		
15.	"	"	"	15	3 पै	-	0.22.7	15.	"	"	"	15	3 पै	-	0-18.7		
16.	"	"	"	17	1 पै	-	0-04.5	16.	"	"	"	कम	किया				

CORRIGENDUM

S. O. 3192.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 1218 dated 4-4-88 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 16-4-88 on pages 1640 to 1642 as “words & figures” shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H. Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Sogaon	Alibag	Raigad	58	2(P)	—	0-10-1	.	Sogaon	Alibag	Raigad	58	2A(P) 2B	—	0-10-1
2.	58	1(P)	—	0-07-5	2.	58	1	—	0-10-0
3.	57	0(P)	—	0-26-5	3.	57	1	—	0-26-5
4.	63	10(P)	—	0-09-1	4.	Deleted			
5.	63	11(P)	—	0-07-1	5.	63	11(P)	—	0-04-0
6.	70	8(P)	—	0-12-6	6.	70	8(P)	—	0-21-0
7.	70	11(P)	—	0-03-0	7.	70	11(P)	—	0-00-2
8.	69	7(P)	—	0-07-5	8.	69	7A(P)	—	0-01-7
9.	69	6	—	0-08-5	9.	69	6(P)	—	0-10-5
10.	8	1	—	0-16-9	10.	8	1(P)	—	0-21-0
11.	8	2	—	0-07-5	11.	8	2 (P)	—	0-01-0
12.	15	4	—	0-07-3	12.	15	4	—	0-02-5
13.	15	1	—	0-05-0	13.	15	1B	—	0-08-0
14.	15	2	—	0-29-5	14.	15	2	—	0-25-0
15.	15	3	—	0-22-7	15.	15	3	—	0- 18-7
16.	17	1	—	0-04-5	16.	Deleted		

सुद्धि-पत्र

का. आ. 3193—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना न. का. आ. 1819 तारीख 3 जून, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) तारीख 18 जून, 1988 पृष्ठ 2373 से 2375 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना*

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन									प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	ज़िला	स. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ. गांव का नाम	तहसील	ज़िला	स. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	अ. गांव का नाम	तहसील	ज़िला
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	मुशेत	अलिबाग	रायगड	61	1	पै	—	0-10.6	1.	मुशेत	अलिबाग	रायगड	61	1	पै	—	0-10.6
2.	"	"	"	61	3	पै	—	0-02.2	2.	"	"	"	61	3	पै	—	0-01.5
3.	"	रु'	रु'	44	2	पै	—	0-33.3	3.	"	"	"	44	2	अ पै	—	0-33.3
4.	"	"	"	42	2	पै	—	0-05.0	4.	"	"	"	42	2	अ पै	—	0-05.0
5.	"	"	"	46	0	पै	—	0-15.1	5.	"	"	"	46	1	पै	—	0-15.1
6.	"	"	"	47	2	पै	—	0-05.0	6.	"	"	"	कम	किया			
7.	"	"	"	87	0	पै	—	0-02.0	7.	"	"	"	87	4	पै	—	0-02.0
8.	"	"	"	86	0	पै	—	0-33.8	8.	"	"	"	86	2	पै	—	0-33.8
9.	"	"	"	24	4	पै	—	0-33.3	9.	"	"	"	24	4	पै	—	0-29.3
10.	"	"	"	13	0	पै	—	0-16.9	10.	"	"	"	13	1	पै	—	0-16.9

[सं. 34027/1/87 - पी.सी. III]

CORRIGENDUM

S. O. 3193.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O 1819 dated 3-6-88 Published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 18-6-88 on pages 2373 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE—(Contd.)

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area ——— H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area ——— H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Musket	Alibag	Raigad	61	1(P)	—	0-10-6	1.	Musket	Alibag	Raigad	61	1A(P)	—	0-10-6
2.	"	"	"	61	3(P)	—	0-02-2	2.	"	"	"	61	3(P)	—	0-01-5
3.	"	"	"	44	2(P)	—	0-33-3	3.	"	"	"	44	2A(P)	—	0-33-3
4.	"	"	"	42	2(P)	—	0-05-0	4.	"	"	"	42	2A(P)	—	0-05-0
5.	"	"	"	46	0(P)	—	0-15-1	5.	"	"	"	46	1(P)	—	0-15-1
6.	"	"	"	47	2(P)	—	0-05-0	6.	"	"	"	Dropped			
7.	"	"	"	87	0(P)	—	0-02-0	7.	"	"	"	87	4(P)	—	0-02-0
8.	"	"	"	86	0(P)	—	0-33-8	8.	"	"	"	86	2(P)	—	0-33-8
9.	"	"	"	24	4(P)	—	0-33-3	9.	"	"	"	24	4(P)	—	0-28-3
10.	"	"	"	13	0(P)	—	0-16-9	10.	"	"	"	13	1(P)	—	0-16-9

[No. 34027/1/87-PC.III]

बुद्धिपत्र

का.प्र. 3194 :--निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का.प्र. 1818 तारीख 3 जून, 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) ता. 18 जून, 1986 पृष्ठ 2371 से 2373 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना।*

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन							
प्र. नं.	नाम का	तहसील	जिला	प्र. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र	प्र. नं.	नाम का	तहसील	जिला	प्र. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र
	नाम						हे. भार.		नाम						हे. भार.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	88	5	--	0-07.0	1.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	88	5+7 पै	--	0-08-7
2.	"	"	"	88	7	--	0-01.7								
3.	"	"	"	89	3 अ	--	0-04.8	2.	"	"	"	89	3 अ	--	0-06.0
4.	"	"	"	89	अ	--	0-01.2	3.	"	"	"	कम किया			
5.	"	"	"	84	6	--	0-10.8	4.	"	"	"	84	6	--	0-10.8

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
6.	"	"	"	83 अ	0 पै	--	0-16.4	5.	"	"	"	83 अ	1 अ पै	--	0-10.9		
								6.	"	"	"	83अ	2 पै	--	0-05.5		
7.	"	"	"	80	1 पै	—	0-02.5	7.	"	"	"	80	1+2 बपे	—	0-02.5	—	
8.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	81	8 पै	—	0-06.0	8	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	81	5अ+8 पै	—	0-06.0		
9.	"	"	"	81	1 पै		0-05.5	9	"	"	"	81	1 अ पै	—	0-04.4		
								10.	"	"	"	81	1 ब पै	—	0-01.1		
10.	"	"	"	80	7 पै	—	0-00.5	11.	"	"	"	80	6+7 पै	—	0-00.5		
11.	"	"	"	94	0 पै	—	0-10.2	12.	"	"	"	कम किया (गुरबरण)					
12.	"	"	"	77	10 पै	—	0-00.2	13.	"	"	"	77	5+6+ 10 पै	—	0-00.2		
12.	"	"	"	96	0 पै	—	0-01.2	14.	"	"	"	कम किया (मार्ग)					2
14.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	76	2+3+ 4 पै	—	0-07.5	15.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगड	76	02 पै	—	0-04.5		
								16.	"	"	"	76	3+4 पै	—	0-03.0		
15.	"	"	"	72	0 पै	—	0-18.2	17.	"	"	"	72	1 पै	—	0-04.5		
								18.	"	"	"	72	2 पै	—	0-10.7		
16.	"	"	"	71	2 पै	—	0-15.9	19.	"	"	"	71	2अ+2 पै	—	0-08.0		
								20.	"	"	"	71	2 ब पै	—	0-07.0		

[सं. 24027/1/87-पो.सो. III]

Corrigendum

S.O. 3194 .—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of Indian Notification No. S.O. 1818 Dated 3-6-88 Published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-Section (ii) dated 18-6-88 on pages 2371 to 2373 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area ——— H. Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area ——— H. Ars.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	88	5(P)	—	0-07-0	1	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	88	5+7(P)	—		0-08-7
2	"	"	"	88	7(P)		0-01-7									
3	"	"	"	89	3A(P)	—	0-04-8	2	"	"	"	89	3A(P)	—		0-06-0
4	"	"	"	89	3B(P)	—	0-01-2	3	"	"	"	Deleted				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
5	"	"	"	84	6(P)	—	0-10-8	4	"	"	"	"	84	6B(P)	—	0-10-8
6	"	"	"	83A	0(P)	—	0-16-4	5	"	"	"	"	83A	1A(P)	—	0-10-9
								6	"	"	"	"	83A	2(P)	—	0-08-5
7	"	"	"	80	1(P)	—	0-02-5	7	"	"	"	"	80	1+2A(P)	—	0-02-5
8	"	"	"	81	8(P)	—	0-06-0	8	"	"	"	"	81	5B+8(P)	—	0-06-0
9	"	"	"	81	1(P)	—	0-05-5	9	"	"	"	"	81	1A(P)	—	0-04-4
								10	"	"	"	"	81	1B(P)	—	0-01-1
10	"	"	"	80	7(P)	—	0-00-5	11	"	"	"	"	80	6+7(P)	—	0-00-5
11	"	"	"	94	0(P)	—	0-00-2	12	"	"	"	"	Deleted Gurcharan.			
12	"	"	"	77	10(P)	—	0-00-2	13	"	"	"	"	77	5+6+10	—	0-00-2
														(P)		
13	"	"	"	96	0(P)	—	0-01-2	14	"	"	"	"	Deleted Road			
14	"	"	"	76	2+3+4	—	0-07-5	15	"	"	"	"	76	2(P)	—	0-04-5
					(P)	..		16	"	"	"	"	76	3+4(P)	—	0-03-0
15	"	"	"	72	0(P)	—	0-18-2	17	"	"	"	"	72	1(P)	—	0-04-5
								18	"	"	"	"	72	2(P)	—	0-13-7
16	"	"	"	71	2(P)	—	0-15-9	19	"	"	"	"	71	2A+3	—	0-08-0
														(P)		
								20	"	"	"	"	71	2B	—	0-07-0

शुद्धि पत्र

[No. 34027/1/87-PC. III]

क। प्र। 13195:—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. प्र। 889 तारीख 12 फरवरी, 88 भारत का राजपत्र भाग 2 खंड 3 (2) ता. 19 मार्च, 88 पृष्ठ 780 से 782 प्रसारित हुए। अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना।

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन									
प्र. नं.	बांध का नाम	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	स.नं.	ग.नं.	क्षेत्र	प्र.नं.	बांध का नाम	तहसील	तहसील	जिला	स.नं.	ग.नं.	क्षेत्र	है.	आर.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	कुजिस	अलिबाग	रायगड	9	4 पं	—	0-20.9	1.	कुजिस	अलिबाग	रायगड	9	4प्र + 4पं	—	0-15.4		
2.	"	"	"	9	5 पं	—	0-18.9	2.	"	"	"	9	5	—	0-22.0		
3.	"	"	"	9	6 पं	—	0-04.3	3.	"	"	"	"	कम किया				

[सं. 34027/1/87-पी.सी.-III]

CORRIGENDUM

S.O.3195. —Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appealing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 689 dated 12-2-88 Published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 19-3-88 on pages 780 to 782 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Name of the village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Gunjis	Alibag	Raigad	9	4(P)	—	0-20-9	1. Gunjis	Alibag	Raigad	9	4A—4B(P) +	—	0-15-4				
2. "	"	"	9	5(P)	—	0-18-9	2. "	"	"	9	5	—	0-22-0				
3. "	"	"	9	6(P)	—	0-04-3	3. "	"	"	Deleted							

[No. 34027/1/87-PC.III]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का. प्रा. 3196. —निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. प्रा. 1.513 तारीख फरवरी, 1988 का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3(ii) तारीख (1) 12 मार्च 88, (2) 5 नवम्बर, 1988 पृष्ठ 619 से 620 और पृष्ठ 4011 से 4012 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची 2.3264 9 अक्टूबर 88 में छपे है। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ाना।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन									
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं.नं.	हि. नं.	गट.नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	गट.नं.	क्षेत्र		
हे. आर.								हे. आर.									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	बोरीस	अलिबाग	रायगड	69	1 पै			0-29.0	1.	बोरीस	अलिबाग	रायगड	69	1 पै.	—	0-14.0	
" 2.	"	"	"	69	6 पै			0-04.8	2.	"	"	"	69	6 पै.	—	0-12.0	
" "	"	"	"	"	103	—		0-48.0	3.	"	"	"	"	103	—	0-30.0	

सं. 34027/1/87-पी. सी. III)

CORRIGENDUM

S.O.3196 .—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of Indian Notification No. S.O. 513/3264 Dated 2-2-88 and 19-10-88 Published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated 12-3-88 and 5-11-88 on pages 619 & 620 and Pages 4011 to 4012 as “words & figures” shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area — H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area — H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Boris	Alibag	Raigad	69	1(P)	—	0-29-0	1.	Boris	Alibag	Raigad	69	1(P)	—	0-14-0
2.	„	„	„	69	6(P)	—	0-04-8	2.	„	„	„	69	6(P)	—	0-12-0
3.	„	„	„	103	0(P)	—	0-48-0	3.	„	„	„	103	0(P)	—	0-30-0

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

शुद्धि पत्र

का. प्रा. 3197 निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 513 तारीख 1988 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड (ii) ता. 12 मार्च, 88 पृष्ठ 619 से 620 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 19 लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ाना।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन							
अ.नं.	शाय का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि० नं.	गेट नं.	क्षेत्र हे. प्रा.	अ.नं.	शाय का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि.नं.	गेट नं.	क्षेत्र हे. प्रा.
(1)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	17 18
1.	मूनबली	अलिबाग	रायगड़	39	0 वं.	—	0-17.9	1.	मूनबली	अलिबाग	रायगड़	39	1 व 2 वं.	—	0-17-9
												39	2		
2.	„	„	„	40	7 वं.	—	0-02.0	2.	„	„	40	40	7 वं वं	—	0-02.0

सं. 34027/1/87—पी.सी. II)

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 3197.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 513 dated 2-2-83 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 12-3-83 on pages 619 as "words & figures" shown in columns 10 to 18 to the shedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Munawali	Alibag	Raigad	39	0(P)	—	0-17-9	1.	Munawali	Alibag	Raigad	39	1B2(P)	—	-17-9
2.	"	"	"	40	7(P)	—	0-02-0	2.	"	"	"	39 40	2(P) 7B(P)	—	0-02-0

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

शुद्धि पत्र

का. आ. 3198.—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में खाना 1 से 9 में विवेकपूर्वक जगहों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 513 तारीख 2 फरवरी, 1983 भारत का राजपत्र, भाग II खंड 3(ii) ता. 12 मार्च, 88 पृष्ठ 619 से 620 प्रकाशित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छे है। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची खाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ाना।

अनुसूची

प्रकाशित किया गया वर्णन

प्रकाशित होने का वर्णन

अ. सं.	गांव का नाम	तहसिल	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र हे आर	अ. सं.	गांव का नाम	तहसिल	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	क्षेत्र हे आर
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	83	अ	—	0—10.8	1.	मापगांव	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	83	1अ प	—	0—07.8
								2.	"	"	"	83अ	2 प.	—	0—07.0

[नं. 34027/1/87-पा सो III]

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 3198.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 to the schedule given below appearing in the schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. S.O. 513 Dated 2-2-88 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 12-3-88 on pages 619 to 620 as “words & figures” shown in columns 10 to 18 to the schedule given below.

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
1.	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	83	A(P)	—	0-10-8	1.	Mapgaon	Alibag	Raigad	83	1A	—	0-03-8
												83A	2	(P)	0-07-0
													(P)		

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का. प्रा. 3199—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में खाली 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए अक्षरों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. प्रा. 197 तारीख 7-1-88 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) 21-01-1933 (23 231 से 232 तम) में दिये अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं इससे वरह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची खाली 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए अक्षरों और संख्या पढ़ाया ।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन								प्रसारित होने का वर्णन							
अं. नं.	गांव का नाम तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	हे क्षेत्र	अं. नं.	गांव का नाम तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	गट नं.	हे क्षेत्र	अं. नं.	गांव का नाम तहसील
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15 16	17 18
33	भिसराई	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	31	1अ	—	—	—	33	भिसराई	अलिबाग	रायगढ़	32	1 अ	—

[सं. 34027/1/87--पी. सी. III]

CORRIGENDUM

S. O. 3199.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 of the schedule given below appearing in the Schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. 197 dated 7-1-1988 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 23-1-88 at pages 281 to 282 as “words and figures shown in columns 10 to 18 of the Schedule given below.”

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the village	Tahsil	Distt	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
33.	Bhisarai	Alibag	Raigad	31	1A	—	—	33.	Bhisarai	Alibag	Raigad	32	1A	—	—

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

शुद्धि पत्र

का. आ. ...- 3200 निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में रकाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना नं. का. आ. 1806 तारीख 6 जुलाई, 1987 भारत का राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 (ii) जुलाई 1987 पृष्ठ 2399 से--प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इससे वजह निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रकाना 10 से 18 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ाना।

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन									प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	अ. नं.	हे	क्षेत्र	अ. नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	ग. ट.	क्षेत्र	
-----									-----								
हे आर									हे आर.								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18	
3	मुंढाणी	पेण	रायगड़	--	--	59	--	--	3	मुंढाणी	पेण	रायगड़	--	--	49	-- --	

[सं. 34027/1/87--पं.सं. III]

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 3200.—Read words and figures shown in columns 1 to 9 of the schedule given below appearing in the Schedule annexed to the Government of India Notification No. 1806 dated 6-7-1987 published in the Gazette of India of Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (i) dated 11-7-87 at page 2399 as “words and figures shown in columns 10 to 18 of the schedule given below.”

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.	Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Tahsil	District	Survey No.	Hissa No.	Gat No.	Area H.Ars.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 18
3.	Mundhani	Pen	Raigad	—	—	59	— —	3.	Mundhani	Pen	Raigad	—	—	49	— —

[No. 34027/1/87-PC-III]

का.आ. 3201—निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में खाना 1 से 9 में लिखे हुए शब्दों और संख्या भारत सरकार की इच्छा नं. का. आ. 27 तारीख 17 दिसम्बर, भारत का राजपत्र राजपत्र भाग II खंड (ii) त्त. 2 जनवरी, 88 पृष्ठ 23 से 44 प्रसारित हुए अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में छपे हैं। इसे वहाँ निम्नलिखित अनुसूची खाना 10 से 18 में लिखे गए शब्दों और संख्या पढ़ना।

अनुसूची

प्रसारित किया गया वर्णन									प्रसारित होने का वर्णन								
अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	ब.नं.	क्षेत्र	अ.नं.	गांव का नाम	तहसील	जिला	सं. नं.	हि. नं.	शट नं.	क्षेत्र		
							हे. आर.								हे. आर.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	बेणसे	वेण	रायगढ़	11	1 अ पै	—	0—33.5	1	बेणसे	वेण	रायगढ़	11	13 अ पै.	—	0—18.0		
				11	1 ब पै.							11	1 ब पै.	—	0—11.0		
				11	2 ब पै							11	2क पै.	—	0—03.0		
1.	क्षोतिरपाडा	वेण	रायगढ़	64	1 पै.	—	0—08.5	1	क्षोतिरपाडा	वेण	रायगढ़	64	1 पै	—	0—02.5		
												64	3 अ पै	—	0—06.0		
2.	"	"	"	66	1 पै	—	0—28.0	2	"	"	"	66	1 अ पै	—	0—15.0		
												66	1ब पै	—	0—12.0		
3.	"	"	"	68	0 पै	—	0—03.0	3	"	"	"	68	1अ पै 1ब पै 2	}	—	0—03.0	
4.	"	"	"	72	1 पै	—	0—01.0	4	"	"	"	72	1/1+ 3/2 पै		—	0—01.0	
5.	"	"	"	74	1 पै	—	0—01.0	5	"	"	"	74	1/1/ पै		—	0—01.0	
6.	क्षोतिरपाडा वेण	रायगढ़	74	3 पै	—	0—19.0	6	क्षोतिरपाडा वेण	रायगढ़	74	3/1 पै	—	0—15.0				
											74	3/2 पै	—	0—04.0			
7.	"	"	"	88	1+3+ 4+5अ पै	—	0—16.0	7	"	"	"	88	1+3+4 +5अ पै	—	0—16.0		
1.	मुंडाणी	वेण	रायगढ़	—	—	59 पै	0—10.0	1	मुंडाणी	वेण	रायगढ़	—	—	49 पै	—	0—10.0	
2.	"	"	"	—	—	27 पै	0—14.0	2	"	"	"	—	—	27 पै	—	0—22.0	
3.	"	"	"	—	—	20 पै	0—07.0	3	"	"	"	—	—	20 पै	—	0—14.0	
4.	"	"	"	—	—	29 पै	0—15.0	4	"	"	"	—	—	29 पै	—	0—07.0	
5.	"	"	"	—	—	212 पै	0—23.0	5	"	"	"	—	—	212 पै	—	0—18.0	
6.	"	"	"	—	—	26 पै	0—05.0	6	"	"	"	—	—	26 पै	—	0—08.0	
7.	"	"	"	—	—	25 पै	0—01.0	7	"	"	"	—	—	25 पै	—	0—01.0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. आटीवली	पेण	रायगड	16	0	पे	—	0-26.0	1	आटीवली	पेण	रायगड	16	0	पे	—	0-20.0	
2. "	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-05.8	2	"	"	"	कम	किया	—	—	—	
3. "	"	"	15	1	पे	—	0-01.0	3	"	"	"	15	1	पे	—	0-08.8	
4. "	"	"	15	2	पे	—	0-02.5	4	"	"	"	15	2	पे	—	0-11.0	
5. "	"	"	18	0	पे	—	0-09.6	5	"	"	"	18	4	पे	—	0-04.2	
6. "	"	"	19	1	पे	—	0-01.2	6	"	"	"	18	5	पे	—	0-01.0	
7. "	"	"	22	0	प	—	0-08.6	7	"	"	"	19	1	पे	—	0-03.5	
8. आटीवली	पेण	रायगड	28	2	पे	—	0-15.0	8	"	"	"	22	1	पे	—	0-03.0	
9. "	"	"	26	2	पे	—	0-29.0	9	आटीवली	पेण	रायगड	28	6	पे	—	0-05.6	
								10	"	"	"	26	2	पे	—	0-13.5	
								11	"	"	"	26	2	पे	—	0-07.6	
								12	"	"	"	26	2	पे	—	0-13.2	
								13	"	"	"	26	2	पे	—	0-08.2	
1. गांधी	पेण	रायगड	15	2	पे	—	0-13.6	1.	गांधी	पेण	रायगड	15	2	पे	—	0-04.0	
2. "	"	"	20	2	पे	—	0-05.5	2.	"	"	"	15	2	पे	—	0-09.6	
3. "	"	"	20	3	पे	—	0-02.7	3.	"	"	"	20	2	पे	—	0-03.0	
4. "	"	"	18	3	पे	—	0-03.5	4.	"	"	"	20	3	पे	—	0-05.2	
5. "	"	"	18	2	पे	—	0-16.4	5.	"	"	"	18	3	पे	—	0-06.7	
6. "	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-05.0	6.	"	"	"	18	2	पे	—	0-09.9	
7. "	"	"	17	2	पे	—	0-04.5	7.	"	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-08.3	
8. "	"	"	17	3	पे	—	0-17.9	8.	"	"	"	17	2	पे	—	0-08.5	
9. "	"	"	16	1	पे	—	0-11.3	9.	"	"	"	17	3	पे	—	0-13.4	
10. "	"	"	16	2	पे	—	0-20.4	10.	"	"	"	16	1	पे	—	0-15.3	
11. "	"	"	16	4	पे	—	0-09.8	11.	"	"	"	16	2	पे	—	0-09.5	
12. "	"	"	15	1	पे	—	0-09.0	12.	"	"	"	16	4	पे	—	0-17.7	
13. "	"	"	24	3	पे	—	0-26.8	13.	"	"	"	15	1	पे	—	0-17.4	
14. "	"	"	30	10	पे	—	0-04.5	14.	"	"	"	24	3	पे	—	0-25.0	
								15.	"	"	"	30	10	पे	—	0-02.8	
1. चोले	पेण	रायगड	11	1+3	पे	—	0-24.0	1.	चोले	रायगड	पेण	11	1	पे	—	0-10.5	
2. "	"	"	14	1	पे	—	0-17.9	2.	"	"	"	11	3	पे	—	0-11.5	
3. "	"	"	14	1	पे	—	0-01.0	3.	"	"	"	14	1	पे	—	0-11.3	
4. "	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-10.0	4.	"	"	"	14	1	पे	—	0-15.4	
5. "	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-12.5	5.	"	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-12.9	
								6.	"	"	"	17	1	पे	—	0-09.6	
6. "	"	"	18	2	पे	—	0-00.5	7.	"	"	"	18	2	पे	—	0-01.0	
7. "	"	"	18	5+6	पे	—	0-24.5	8.	"	"	"	18	5	पे	—	0-09.5	
								9.	"	"	"	18	6	पे	—	0-14.5	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. दुर्गदर्या	अलिबाग	रायगड	3	1	पे	—	0-52.4	1.	दुर्गदर्या	अलिबाग	रायगड	3	1	पे	—	0-28.0	
2. "	"	"	3	2	पे	—	0-01.0	2.	"	"	"	3	2अ	पे	—	0-17.9	
								3.	"	"	"	3	2ब	पे	—	0-07.5	
1. सांबरी	अलिबाग	रायगड	26	0	पे	—	0-00.7	1.	सांबरी	अलिबाग	रायगड	26	1	पे	—	0-00.7	
2. "	"	"	41	2	ब	—	0-21.7	2.	"	"	"	41	2अ	पे	—	0-19.4	
3. "	"	"	42	2	ब	पे	—	0-05.2	3.	"	"	42	1अ	पे	—	0-07.1	
1. नवखार तर्फ	अलिबाग	रायगड	18	1	पे	—	0-19.0	1.	नवखार तर्फ	अलिबाग	रायगड	18	1अ	पे	—	0-04.3	
श्रीगांव									श्रीगांव			18	1ब	पे	—	0-14.7	
2. "	"	"	17	5	पे	—	0-24.0	2.	"	"	"	17	5अ	पे	—	0-24.0	
3. "	"	"	39	2	पे	—	0-21.0	3.	"	"	"	39	2अ	पे	—	0-20.0	
												39	2ब	पे	—	0-01.0	
4. "	"	"	39	4	पे	—	0-10.0	4.	"	"	"	39	4	पे	—	0-06.9	
5. "	"	"	38	1	पे	—	0-15.0	5.	"	"	"	38	1	पे	—	0-04.5	
6. "	"	"	36	1	पे	—	0-07.5	6.	"	"	"	36	3अ	पे	—	0-12.0	
			36	3	पे	—						36	3अ	पे	—	0-06.4	
7. "	"	"	37	2	पे	—	0-00.5	7.	"	"	"	37	2	पे	—	0-05.2	
8. "	"	"	38	5	पे	—	0-04.0	8.	"	"	"	38	5	पे	—	0-01.3	
9. "	"	"	37	4	ब	पे	—	0-11.0	9.	"	"	37	4ब	पे	—	0-10.0	
10. "	"	"	44	3	पे	—	0-04.0	10.	"	"	"	44	3	पे	—	0-02.0	
1. सिमादेवी	अलिबाग	रायगड	12	1	पे	—	0-05.5	1.	सिमादेवी	अलिबाग	रायगड	12	1+2	पे	—	0-16.8	
2. "	"	"	12	2	पे	—	0-11.3										
1. कणसापूर	अलिबाग	रायगड	9	2	पे	—	0-14.0	1.	कणसापूर	अलिबाग	रायगड	9	2	पे	—	0-19.4	
2. "	"	"	8	2	पे	—	0-14.0	2.	"	"	"	8	2	पे	—	0-07.0	
3. "	"	"	8	3	पे	—	0-16.0	3.	"	"	"	8	3	पे	—	0-30.5	
4. "	"	"	7	2अ	पे	—	0-13.0	4.	"	"	"	7	2अ	पे	—	0-03.0	
5. "	"	"	31	2	पे	—	0-04.0	5.	"	"	कम किया।	31	2	पे	—	0-07.0	
6. "	"	"	9	4	पे	—	0-16.0										
7. "	"	"	8	4	पे	—	0-14.5										
8. "	"	"	7	2ब	पे	—	0-01.0										
1. कुहंस	अलिबाग	रायगड	26	3	पे	—	0-00.3	1.	कुहंस	अलिबाग	रायगड	26	3	पे	—	0-01.0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. खार-कोपरी अलिबाग	रायगड	1	1 पै.	—	0—04.5	1.	खार-कोपरी अलिबाग	रायगड	1	1 पै.	—	0—06—5					
2. "	"	1	2 पै. }	—	0—02.7	2.	"	"	1	2 पै.	—	0—00.7					
3. "	"	8	2 पै. }	—	0—11.6	3.	"	"	8	2 पै.	—	0—11.9					
4. "	"	13	2 अ पै.	—	0—16.9	4.	"	"	13	2अ. पै.	—	0—15.9					
			2 ब														
5. "	"	26	3 अ	—	0—10.8	5.	"	"	26	3अ पै.	—	0—05.8					
		26	3 ब			6.	"	"	26	3ब पै.	—	0—05.0					
6. "	"	24	2 पै.	—	0—25.0	7.	"	"	24	2अ पै.	—	0—02.5					
						8.	"	"	24	2ब पै.	—	0—22.5					
7. "	"	24	4 अ पै.	—	0—08-8	9.	"	"	25	4 अ पै.	—	0—22.3					
8. "	"	22	2 ब पै.	—	0—02.5	10.	"	"	22	2 ब पै.	—	0—02.2					
9. "	"	22	2 पै.	—	0—16.4	11.	"	"	22	3 पै.	—	0—14.0					
10. "	"	23	2 पै.	—	0—03.7	12.	"	"	23	2 पै.	—	0—00.4					
11. "	"	23	4 पै.	—	0—00.7	13.	"	"	23	4 पै.	—	0—04.0					
1. चिखली अलिबाग	रायगड	32	2अ पै.	—	0 14.9	1	चिखली अलिबाग	रायगड	32	2अ पै.	—	0 04.5					
2. "	"	32	2ब पै.	—	0 17.6	2	"	"	32	2ब पै.	—	0 14.5					
3. "	"	32	4 पै.	—	0 04.3	3	"	"	32	4 पै.	—	0 12.2					
4. "	"	15 अ	3 पै.	—	0 06.0	4	"	"	15अ	3 पै.	—	0 02.5					
5. "	"	17	3 पै.	—	0 02.5	5	"	"	17	3 पै.	—	0 06.0					
6. "	"	11	2 पै.	—	0 30.0	6	"	"	11	2ब पै.	—	0 30.0					
7. "	"	7अ, ब	पै.	—	0 15.0	7	"	"	7	1अ 1पै.	—	0 15.0					
8. "	"	7	1 1पै.	—	0 09.6	8	"	"	7	1ब 1पै.	—	0 09.6					
1. वाघविरा अलिबाग	रायगड	1	1 पै.	—	0 02.5	1	वाघविरा अलिबाग	रायगड	1	1 पै.	—	0 0.7					
2. "	"	1	3 पै.	—	0 05.5	2	"	"	1	3 पै.	—	0 02.3					
3. "	"	2	3 पै.	—	0 20.4	3	"	"	2	3/2अपै.	—	0 07.0					
						4	"	"	2	3/2ब पै.	—	0 13.4					
4. "	"	5	1ब	—	0 26.0	5	"	"	5	1ब 1पै.	—	0 10.0					
						6	"	"	5	1ब 2पै.	—	0 16.0					
5. "	"	6	2 पै.	—	0 01.7	7	"	"	6	3 पै.	—	0 01.7					
6. "	"	6	3 पै.	—	00 08.8	8	"	"	6	2 पै.	—	0 08.8					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. पिठकरी	अलिबाग	रायगड	71	0 पे	—	0 34.4	1	पिठकरी	अलिबाग	रायगड	71	1 पे	—	0 37.5			
2. "	"	"	66	1 पे	—	0 07.3	2	"	"	"	66	2	—	0 03.0			
3. "	"	"	66	3 पे	—	0 12.6	3	"	"	"	66	3अ पे	—	0 00.5			
4. "	"	"	66	2	—	0 24.0	4	"	"	"	66	3ब पे	—	0 17.2			
5. "	"	"	64	1अ	—	0 10.3	5	"	"	"	64	2 पे	—	0 29.2			
6. "	"	"	64	2अ 1	—	0 05.3	6	"	"	"	64	1अ पे	—	0 16.0			
7. "	"	"	64	1ब	—	0 20.2	7	"	"	"	64	2अ 1पे	—	0 00.5			
8. "	"	"	64	2अ 2	—	0 08.3	8	"	"	"	64	1ब पे	—	0 00.2			
9. "	"	"	70	1	—	0 00.2	9	"	"	"	70	2अ 2पे	—	0 13.2			
10. "	"	"	64	2ब	—	0 17.7	10	"	"	"	64	1अ, 1ब	—	0 00.2			
11. "	"	"	61	4	—	0 02.7	11	"	"	"	61	2ब प	—	0 13.8			
12. "	"	"	61	5अ	—	0 06.0	12	"	"	"	61	4 प	—	0 00.2			
13. "	"	"	62	1ब	—	0 00.7	13	"	"	"	62	5ब प	—	0 00.00			
14. "	"	"	62	1क	—	0 01.0	14	"	"	"	62	2ब पे	—	0 02.5			
15. "	"	"	62	2	—	0 05.0	15	"	"	"	62	1क पे	—	0 03.0			
16. "	"	"	62	3	—	0 14.6	16	"	"	"	62	2 पे	—	0 09.0			
17. "	"	"	63	0	—	0 02.7	17	"	"	"	63	3 पे	—	0 80.0			
18. "	"	"	64	3अ	—	0 02.7	18	"	"	"	64	0 पे	—	0 07.0			
19. "	"	"	61	5अ	—	0 13.4	19	"	"	"	61	कम किं०					
1. कुसंबले	अलिबाग	रायगड	135	4ब टै	—	0 2.0	1	कुसंबले	अलिबाग	रायगड	136	4 ब टै	—	0 2.0			
2. "	"	"	143	7 पे	—	0 8.8	2	"	"	"	143	7 पे	—	0 12.0			
3. "	"	"	143	8अ } पे 8ब }	—	0 11.0	3	"	"	"	143	8अ 8ब	—	0 07.0			
1. खानविरा	अलिबाग	रायगड	16	7 पे	—	0-15.6	1	खानविरा	अलिबाग	रायगड	16	7 पे	—	0-15.2			
2. "	"	"	16	6ब पे	—	0-6.0	2	"	"	"	16	6अ पे	—	0-08.2			
3. "	"	"	13	1 पे	—	0-1.0	3	"	"	"	13	1 पे	—	0-00.2			
4. "	"	"	13	2 पे	—	0-18.5	4	"	"	"	13	2 अ	—	0-21.2			
5. "	"	"	13	7 पे	—	0-8.5	5	"	"	"	13	7 पे	—	0-05.0			
6. "	"	"	13	8 पे	—	0-2.5	6	"	"	"	13	8 पे	—	0-00.2			
7. "	"	"	13	9 प	—	0-15.5	7	"	"	"	13	9 पे	—	0-22.5			
8. "	"	"	11	1 पे	—	0-7.8	8	"	"	"	11	1 पे	—	0-06.0			
9. "	"	"	11	2 पे	—	0-10.0	9	"	"	"	11	2 पे	—	0-23.5			
10. "	"	"	11	5 पे	—	0-06.3	10	"	"	"	11	5 पे	—	0-00.2			
11. "	"	"	10	1अब पे	—	0-07.3	11	"	"	"	10	1ब पे	—	0-01.5			
12. "	"	"	8	2अ पे	—	0-20.7	12	"	"	"	8	2अ 2	—	0-18.5			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
13.	खातविरा	अलिबाग	रायगड	8	अ पै.	--	0-12.9	13	खातविरा	अलिबाग	रायगड	8	अ पै.	--	--	0-01.0	
14.	"	"	"	6	1 पै.	--	0-11.3	14	"	"	"	6	1 पै.	--	--	0-02.5	
15.	"	"	"	6	2 पै.	--	0-16.8	15	"	"	"	6	2 पै.	--	--	0-18.7	
16.	"	"	"	6	अ 2पै.	--	0-36.0	16	"	"	"	6	अ 1 पै.	--	--	0-07.0	
								17	"	"	"	6	अ 2 प.	--	--	0-21.0	
								18	"	"	"	6	अ पै.	--	--	0-05.0	
17.	"	"	"	8	अ 1पै.	--	0-01-2	19	"	"	"	कम किया				--	--
1.	कालवड	"	"	1	2+3+4		0-07.3	1.	कालवड	"	"	1	2+3+4		--	--	0-09.5
					8 पै								इ				
2.	"	"	"	44	4 पै.	--	0-09.3	2.	"	"	"	44	4 प.	--	--	--	0-13.0
1.	श्रीगाव	"	"	4	अ पै.	--	0-09.7	1.	श्रीगाव	"	"	4	अ 1पै.	--	--	--	0-12.1
2.	"	"	"	4	अ पै.	--	0-02.5	2.	"	"	"	4	अ पै.	--	--	--	0-00.1
3.	"	"	"	14अ	1 पै.	--	0-08.6	3.	"	"	"	14अ	1 पै.	--	--	--	0-07.8
4.	"	"	"	14अ/2	2 पै.	--	0-23.2	4.	"	"	"	14अ	2/1 पै.	--	--	--	0-21.0
5.	"	"	"	4	अ पै.	--	0-07.5	5.	"	"	"	4	अ पै.	--	--	--	0-08.3
6.	"	"	"	34	2 अ.	--	0-15.0	6.	"	"	"	34	अ अ.	--	--	--	0-15.0
7.	"	"	"	34	3 पै.	--	0-01.5	7.	"	"	"	34	अ अ.	--	--	--	0-01.5
8.	"	"	"	36	0 पै.	--	0-14.1	8.	"	"	"	36	1 पै.	--	--	--	0-14.1
9.	"	"	"	37	1 पै.	--	0-19.2	9.	"	"	"	37	1 पै.	--	--	--	0-16.4
10.	"	"	"	45	0 पै.	--	0-34.3	10.	"	"	"	45	अ 1पै	--	--	--	0-34.3
													1 पै.	--	--	--	
11.	"	"	"	49	1 पै.	--	0-16.4	11.	"	"	"	49	अ पै.	--	--	--	0-16.4
1.	पोयनाड	"	रायगड	180	1/1 पै.	--	0-96.2	1.	पोयनाड	"	"	180	1/1 पै.	--	--	--	0-49.7
2.	"	"	"	180	2 पै.	--	0-09.0	2.	"	"	"	180	1/1 पै.	--	--	--	0-09.0
1.	वेमारी	"	"	5	4 पै.	--	0-17.4	1.	वेमारी	"	"	5	4 पै.	--	--	--	0-15.2
2.	"	"	"	5	5 पै.	--	0-01.2	2.	"	"	"	5	5 पै.	--	--	--	0-05.2
3.	"	"	"	5	8 पै.	--	0-01.2	3.	"	"	"	5	8 पै.	--	--	--	0-06.0
4.	"	"	"	8	1 प.	--	0-15.6	4.	"	"	"	8	1 प.	--	--	--	0-13.7
5.	"	"	"	8	2 पै.	--	0-07.8	5.	"	"	"	8	2 पै.	--	--	--	0-03.0
6.	"	"	"	8	3 प.	--	0-07.5	6.	"	"	"	8	3 पै.	--	--	--	0-08.3
7.	"	"	"	9	7 पै.	--	0-15.9	7.	"	"	"	9	7 पै.	--	--	--	0-19.1
8.	"	"	"	9	8 प.	--	0-03.2	8.	"	"	"	9	8 पै.	--	--	--	0-00.4
9.	"	"	"	1	1 प.	--	0-20.4	9.	"	"	"	1	1 पै.	--	--	--	0-19.9
10.	"	"	"	80	5(2)2	--	0-18.8	10.	"	"	"	80	5/2 1पै.	--	--	--	0-04.0
11.	"	"	"	79	2 पै.	--	0-24.7	11.	"	"	"	80	5/2 2पै.	--	--	--	0-14.8
12.	"	"	"	79	1 पै.	--	0-16.1	12.	"	"	"	79	1+2अ पै.	--	--	--	0-24.7
13.	"	"	"	9	6 पै.	--	0-01.2	13.	"	"	"	79	1+2अ पै.	--	--	--	0-16.1

कम किया

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Gandhe	Pen	Raigad	15	2(P)	—	0-13-6	1	Gandhe	Pen	Raigad	15	2A(P)	—	0-04-0			
2. -do-	-do-	-do-	20	2(P)	—	0-05-5	2	-do-	-do-	-do-	15	2B(P)	—	0-04-6			
3. -do-	-do-	-do-	20	3(P)	—	0-02-7	3	-do-	-do-	-do-	20	2(P)	—	0-03-0			
4. -do-	-do-	-do-	18	3(P)	—	0-03-5	4	-do-	-do-	-do-	20	3(P)	—	0-05-2			
5. -do-	-do-	-do-	18	2(P)	—	0-16-4	5	-do-	-do-	-do-	18	3(P)	—	0-06-7			
6. -do-	-do-	-do-	17	1(P)	—	0-05-0	6	-do-	-do-	-do-	18	2(P)	—	0-09-9			
7. -do-	-do-	-do-	17	2(P)	—	0-04-5	7	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	1(P)	—	0-08-3			
8. -do-	-do-	-do-	17	3(P)	—	0-17-9	8	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	2(P)	—	0-08-5			
9. -do-	-do-	-do-	16	1(P)	—	0-11-3	9	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	3(P)	—	0-13-4			
10. -do-	-do-	-do-	16	2(P)	—	0-20-4	10	-do-	-do-	-do-	16	1(P)	—	0-15-3			
11. -do-	-do-	-do-	16	4(P)	—	0-09-8	11	-do-	-do-	-do-	16	2(P)	—	0-09-5			
12. -do-	-do-	-do-	15	1(P)	—	0-09-0	12	-do-	-do-	-do-	16	4(P)	—	0-17-7			
13. -do-	-do-	-do-	24	3(P)	—	0-26-8	13	-do-	-do-	-do-	15	1(P)	—	0-17-4			
14. -do-	-do-	-do-	30	10(P)	—	0-04-5	14	-do-	-do-	-do-	24	3(P)	—	0-25-0			
							15	-do-	-do-	-do-	30	10(P)	—	0-02-8			
1. Chole	Pen	Raigad	11	1+3(P)	—	0-24-0	1	Chole	Pen	Raigad	11	1(P)	—	0-10-5			
2. -do-	-do-	-do-	14	1+B(P)	—	0-17-9	2	-do-	-do-	-do-	11	3(P)	—	0-11-5			
3. -do-	-do-	-do-	14	1-A(P)	—	0-1-0	3	-do-	-do-	-do-	14	1B(P)	—	0-11-3			
4. -do-	-do-	-do-	17	1-C(P)	—	0-10-0	4	-do-	-do-	-do-	14	1-A(P)	—	0-15-4			
5. -do-	-do-	-do-	17	1-B+1F +1E 2A, 2B (P)	—	0-12-5	5	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	1-F(P)	—	0-12-9			
							6	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	1B(P)	—	0-09-6			
6. -do-	-do-	-do-	18	2(P)	—	0-00-5	7	-do-	-do-	-do-	18	2(P)	—	0-01-0			
7. -do-	-do-	-do-	18	5(P)	—	0-24-5	8	-do-	-do-	-do-	18	5(P)	—	0-09-5			
											18	6A+6B (P)	—	0-14-5			
1. Durgadarya	Alibag	Raigad	3	1(P)	—	0-52-4	1	Durgadarya	Alibag	Raigad	3	1(P)	—	0-28-0			
			3	2(P)	—	0-01-0					3	2A(P)	—	0-17-9			
											3	2B(P)	—	0-07-5			
1. Sambari	Alibag	Raigad	26	0(P)	—	0-00-7	1	Sambari	Alibag	Raigad	26	1(P)2	—	0-00-7			
2. -do-	-do-	-do-	41	2A2(P)	—	0-21-7	2	-do-	-do-	-do-	41	2A(2)	—	0-19-4			
3. -do-	-do-	-do-	42	2A(P)	—	0-05-2	3	-do-	-do-	-do-	42	1A(P)	—	0-07-1			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	Navkhar Tarf Shrigaon	Alibag	Raigad	18	1(P)	—	0-19-1		1	Navkhar Tarf Shrigaon	Alibag	Raigad	18	1A(P)	—	0-04-3	
2	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	5(P)	—	0-24-0		2	-do-	-do-	-do-	18	1B(P)	—	0-14-7	
3	-do-	-do-	-do-	39	2(P)	—	0-21-0		3	-do-	-do-	-do-	17	5A(P)	—	0-24-0	
													39	2A(P)	—	0-20-0	
													39	2B(P)	—	0-01-0	
4	-do-	-do-	-do-	39	4(P)	—	0-10-0		4	-do-	-do-	-do-	39	4(P)	—	0-60-9	
5	-do-	-do-	-do-	38	1(P)	—	0-15-0		5	-do-	-do-	-do-	38	1(P)	—	0-04-5	
6	-do-	-do-	-do-	36	1(P)	—	0-07-5		6	-do-	-do-	-do-	36	3A(P)	—	0-12-0	
				36	3(P)	—							36	3B(P)	—	0-06-4	
7	-do-	-do-	-do-	37	2(P)	—	0-00-5		7	-do-	-do-	-do-	37	2(P)	—	0-05-2	
8	-do-	-do-	-do-	38	5(P)	—	0-04-0		8	-do-	-do-	-do-	38	5(P)	—	0-01-3	
9	-do-	-do-	-do-	37	4B(P)	—	0-11-0		9	-do-	-do-	-do-	37	4B(P)	—	0-10-0	
10	-do-	-do-	-do-	44	3(P)	—	0-04-0		10	-do-	-do-	-do-	44	3(P)	—	0-02-0	
1.	Seemadevi	-do-	-do-	12	1(P)	—	0-05-5		1	Seemadevi	-do-	-do-	12	1+2(P)	—	0-16-8	
				12	2(P)		0-11-3										
1.	Phansapur	-do-	-do-	9	2(P)	—	0-14-0		1	Phansapur	-do-	-do-	9	2(P)	—	0-19-4	
2	"	-do-	-do-	8	2(P)	—	0-14-0		2	"	-do-	-do-	8	2(P)	—	0-07-0	
3	"	-do-	-do-	8	3(P)	—	0-16-0		3	"	-do-	-do-	8	3(P)	—	0-30-5	
4	"	-do-	-do-	7	2A(P)	—	0-13-0		4	"	-do-	-do-	7	2A(P)	—	0-03-0	
5	"	-do-	-do-	31	2(P)	—	0-04-0		5	"	-do-	-do-	31	2(P)	—	0-07-0	
6	"	-do-	-do-	9	4(P)		0-16-0			"	-do-	-do-					
7	"	-do-	-do-	8	4(P)		0-14-5			"	-do-	-do-					
8	"	-do-	-do-	7	2B(P)		0-01-0			"	-do-	-do-					
1	Kurdus	-do-	-do-	26	3(P)	—	0-00-3		1	Kurdus	-do-	-do-	26	3(P)	—	0-01-0	
1	Khar Kopari	-do-	-do-	1	1(P)	—	0-04-05		1	Khar Kopari	-do-	-do-	1	1(P)	—	0-06-5	
2	"	-do-	-do-	1	2(P)	—	0-02-7		2	"	-do-	-do-	1	2(P)	—	0-00-7	
3	"	-do-	-do-	8	2(P)	—	0-11-6		3	"	-do-	-do-	8	2(P)	—	0-11-9	
4	"	-do-	-do-	13	2A					"	-do-	-do-					
				13	2B(P)	—	0-16-9		4	"	-do-	-do-	13	2A(P)	—	0-15-9	

Deleted.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5	Khar Kopari	Alibag	Raigad	26	3A]				5	Khar	Alibag	Raigad	26	3A (P)	—	0-05-8	
				26	3B)J (P)	—	0-10-8	6		Kopari	"	"	26	3B (P)	—	0-05-0	
6	"	"	"	24	2 (P)	—	0-25-0	7		"	"	"	24	2A (P)	—	0-02-5	
								8		"	"	"	24	2B (P)	—	0-22-5	
7	"	"	"	24	4A (P)	—	0-08-8	9		"	"	"	24	4A (P)	—	0-06-3	
8	"	"	"	22	2B (P)	—	0-02-5	10		"	"	"	22	2B (P)	—	0-02-2	
9	"	"	"	22	3 (P)	—	0-16-4	11		"	"	"	22	3 (P)	—	0-14-0	
10	"	"	"	23	2 (P)	—	0-03-7	12		"	"	"	23	2 (P)	—	0-00-4	
11	"	"	"	23	4 (P)	—	0-00-7	13		"	"	"	23	4 (P)	—	0-04-0	
1	Chikhali	"	"	32	2A (P)	—	0-14-9	1	Chikhali	"	"	"	32	2A (P)	—	0-04-5	
2	"	"	"	32	2B (P)	—	0-17-6	2	"	"	"	"	32	2B (P)	—	0-14-5	
3	"	"	"	32	4 (P)	—	0-04-3	3	"	"	"	"	32	4 (P)	—	0-12-2	
4	"	"	"	15A	3 (P)	—	0-06-0	4	"	"	"	"	15A	3 (P)	—	0-02-5	
5	"	"	"	17	3 (P)	—	0-02-5	5	"	"	"	"	17	3 (P)	—	0-06-0	
6	"	"	"	11	2 (P)	—	0-30-0	6	"	"	"	"	11	2B(P)	—	0-30-0	
7	"	"	"	7A, B	—(P)	—	0-15-0	7	"	"	"	"	7	1A1 (P)	—	0-15-0	
8	"	"	"	7	1(1) (P)	—	0-09-6	8	"	"	"	"	7	1B 1 (P)	—	0-09-6	
1	Waghveera	"	"	1	1 (P)	—	0-02-5	1	Waghveera	"	"	"	1	1 (P)	—	0-05-7	
2	"	"	"	1	3 (P)	—	0-05-5	2	"	"	"	"	1	3 (P)	—	0-02-3	
3	"	"	"	2	3 (P)	—	0-20-4	3	"	"	"	"	2	3/2A(P)	—	0-07-0	
								4	"	"	"	"	2	3/2-B(P)	—	0-13-4	
4	"	"	"	5/B	— (P)	—	0-26-0	5	"	"	"	"	5	1/B-1(P)	—	0-10-0	
								6	"	"	"	"	5	1/B-2(P)	—	0-16-0	
5	"	"	"	6	2(P)	—	0-01-7	7	"	"	"	"	6	3 (P)	—	0-01-7	
6	"	"	"	6	3 (P)	—	0-08-8	8	"	"	"	"	6	2 (P)	—	0-08-8	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	Pitkiri	Alibag	Raigad	71	0 (P)	—	0-34-4	1	Pitkiri	Alibag	Raigad	71	1 (P)	—	0-37-5		
2	"	"	"	66	1 (P)	—	0-07-3	2	"	"	"	66	2 (P)	—	0-03-0		
3	"	"	"	66	3 (P)	—	0-12-6	3	"	"	"	66	3A (P)	—	0-00-5		
4	"	"	"	66	2 (P)	—	0-24-0	4	"	"	"	66	3B (P)	—	0-17-2		
5	"	"	"	64	1A (P)	—	0-10-3	5	"	"	"	66	2 (P)	—	0-29-2		
6	"	"	"	64	2A1(P)	—	0-05-3	6	"	"	"	64	1A (P)	—	0-16-0		
7	"	"	"	64	1B (P)	—	0-20-2	7	"	"	"	64	2A1(P)	—	0-00-5		
8	"	"	"	64	2A2(P)	—	0-08-3	8	"	"	"	64	1B (P)	—	0-00-2		
9	"	"	"	70	1 (P)	—	0-00-2	9	"	"	"	64	2A2(P)	—	0-13-2		
10	"	"	"	64	2B (P)	—	0-17-7	10	"	"	"	70	1A (P)	—	0-00-2		
11	"	"	"	61	4 (P)	—	0-02-7	11	"	"	"	64	1B (P)	—	0-00-2		
12	"	"	"	61	5B(P)	—	0-06-0	12	"	"	"	61	2B (P)	—	0-13-8		
13	"	"	"	62	1B (P)	—	0-00-7	13	"	"	"	61	4 (P)	—	0-00-2		
14	"	"	"	62	1-C(P)	—	0-01-0	14	"	"	"	62	5B(P)	—	0-10-0		
15	"	"	"	62	2 (P)	—	0-05-0	15	"	"	"	62	1B (P)	—	0-02-5		
16	"	"	"	62	3 (P)	—	0-14-6	16	"	"	"	62	1-C(P)	—	0-03-0		
17	"	"	"	63	— (P)	—	0-02-7	17	"	"	"	62	2 (P)	—	0-09-0		
18	"	"	"	64	3A (P)	—	0-02-7	18	"	"	"	62	3 (P)	—	0-08-0		
19	"	"	"	61	5A	—	0-13-4	19	"	"	"	63	— (P)	—	0-07-0		
1	Kusumbale	"	"	135	4B(P)	—	0-02-0	1	Kusumbale	"	"	To be deleted.					
2	"	"	"	143	7 (P)	—	0-08-0	2	"	"	"	136	4B (P)	—	0-02-0		
3	"	"	"	143	8A (P)	—	0-11-0	3	"	"	"	143	7 (P)	—	0-12-8		
1	Khatveera	"	"	16	7 (P)	—	0-15-6	1	Khatveera	"	"	143	8A (P)	—	0-07-0		
2	"	"	"	16	6B (P)	—	0-06-0	2	"	"	"	16	8B	—			
3	"	"	"	13	1 (P)	—	0-01-0	3	"	"	"	16	7 (P)	—	0-15-0		
4	"	"	"	13	2 (P)	—	0-18-0	4	"	"	"	16	6A (P)	—	0-08-2		
5	"	"	"	13	7 (P)	—	0-08-0	5	"	"	"	13	1 (P)	—	0-00-2		
6	"	"	"	13	8 (P)	—	0-02-0	6	"	"	"	13	2 (P)	—	0-21-2		
7	"	"	"	13	9 (P)	—	0-15-4	7	"	"	"	13	7 (P)	—	0-05-0		
8	"	"	"	11	1 (P)	—	0-07-8	8	"	"	"	13	8 (P)	—	0-00-0		
												11	9 (P)	—	0-22-5		
												11	1 (P)	—	0-06-0		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	1
9	Khatveera	Alibag	Raigad	11	2 (P)	—	0-10-0	9	Khatveera	Alibag	Raigad	11	2 (P)	—	0-23-5		
10	"	"	"	11	5 (P)	—	0-06-3	10	"	"	"	11	5 (P)	—	0-00-2		
11	"	"	"	10	1AB(P)	—	0-07-3	11	"	"	"	10	1-B(P)	—	0-01-5		
12	"	"	"	8	2A2(P)	—	0-20-7	12	"	"	"	8	2A2(P)	—	0-18-5		
13	"	"	"	8	2B(P)	—	0-12-9	13	"	"	"	8	2B(P)	—	0-10-0		
14	"	"	"	6	1 (P)	—	0-11-3	14	"	"	"	6	1 (P)	—	0-02-5		
15	"	"	"	6	2 (P)	—	0-16-9	15	"	"	"	6	2 (P)	—	0-18-7		
16	"	"	"	6	3A2 (P)	—	0-36-0	16	"	"	"	6	3A1(P)	—	0-07-0		
								17	"	"	"	6	3A2(P)	—	0-21-0		
								18	"	"	"	6	3B(P)	—	0-05-0		
17	"	"	"	8	2A1(P)	—	0-01-2	19	"	"	"		Deleted.				
1	Kaiwad	"	"	1	2+3+4	—	0-07-3	1	Kaiwad	"	"	1	2+3+4	—	0-09-5		
					8 (P)								E (P)				
2	"	"	"	44	4 (P)	—	0-09-3	2	"	"	"	44	4 (P)	—	0-13-0		
1	Shrigaon	"	"	4	3A (P)	—	0-09-7	1	Shrigaon	"	"	4	3A1(P)	—	0-12-1		
2	"	"	"	4	1A (P)	—	0-02-5	2	"	"	"	4	1A (P)	—	0-00-1		
3	"	"	"	14 A	1 (P)	—	0-08-6	3	"	"	"	14A	1A (P)	—	0-07-8		
4	"	"	"	14A/2	2 (P)	—	0-23-2	4	"	"	"	14A	2 (P)	—	0-21-0		
													—				
5	"	"	"	4	1-B(P)	—	0-07-5	5	"	"	"	4	1B(P)	—	0-08-3		
6	"	"	"	34	2-2(P)	—	0-15-0	6	"	"	"	34	2A2(P)	—	0-15-0		
7	"	"	"	34	3 (P)	—	0-01-5	7	"	"	"	34	2A3(P)	—	0-01-0		
8	"	"	"	36	0 (P)	—	0-14-1	8	"	"	"	36	1 (P)	—	0-14-1		
9	Shrigaon	"	"	37	1 (P)	—	0-19-2	9	"	"	"	37	1 (P)	—	0-16-4		
10	"	"	"	45	0 (P)	—	0-34-3	10	"	"	"	45	1A	—	0-34-3		
													—1B (P)				
													1				
11	"	"	"	49	1(P)	—	0-16-4	11	"	"	"	49	1A(P)	—	0-16-4		
1	Poynad	"	"	180	1/1(P)	—	0-96-2	1	Poynad	"	"	180	1/1(P)	—	0-49-7		
2	"	"	"	180	2	—	0-09-0	2	"	"	"	180	1/1(P)	—	0-09-0		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	Pezari	Alibag	Raigad	5	4 (P)	—	0-16-4	1	Pezari	Alibag	Raigad	5	4 (P)	—	0-15-2		
2	"	"	"	5	5 (P)	—	0-01-2	2	"	"	"	5	5 (P)	—	0-05-2		
3	"	"	"	5	8 (P)	—	0-01-2	3	"	"	"	5	8 (P)	—	0-06-0		
4	"	"	"	8	1 (P)	—	0-15-6	4	"	"	"	8	1 (P)	—	0-12-7		
5	"	"	"	8	2 (P)	—	0-07-8	5	"	"	"	8	2 (P)	—	0-03-0		
6	"	"	"	8	3 (P)	—	0-07-5	6	"	"	"	8	3 (P)	—	0-08-3		
7	"	"	"	9	6 (P)	—	0-01-2	7	Deleted being Z.P. Road.								
8	"	"	"	9	7 (P)	—	0-15-9	8	"	"	"	9	7 (P)	—	0-19-4		
9	"	"	"	9	8(P)	..	0-03-2	9	Pezari	Alibag	Raigad	9	8(P)	..	0-00-4		
10	"	"	"	1	1(P)	..	0-20-4	10	"	"	"	1	1(P)	..	0-01-1		
11	"	"	"	80	5/2-2 (P)	..	0-18-8	11	"	"	"	80	5/2-1 (P)	..	0-04-0		
								12				80	5/2-2	..	0-14-		
12	"	"	"	79	2(P)	..	0-24-7	13	"	"	"	79	1+2B (P)	..	0-24-7		
13	"	"	"	79	1(P)	..	0-16-1	14	"	"	"	79	1+2A (P)	..	0-16-1		
1	Navkhar Tarf Rayande	Alibag	Raigad	5	3A 3(B)(P)	..	0-01-7	1	Navkhar Tarf Rayande	Alibag	Raigad	5	3B(P)	..	0-01-7		
1	Gaokhar	Alibag	Raigad	6	1 } 6 2 } (P)		0-07-3	1	Gaokhar	Alibag	Raigad	6	1(P)	—	0-07-3		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	11	12	14	15	16	17	18
2	"	"	"		7 1) 7 2)	(P) —	0-05-0	2	"	"	"	"	7	1(P)	—	0-05-0	
3	"	"	"		8 1A) 8 1B)	(P) —	0-17-7	3	"	"	"	"	8	1A(P)	—	0-17-7	
4	"	"	"		8 4A) 8 4B)	(P) —	0-12-9	4	"	"	"	"	8	4A(P)	—	0-12-9	
5	"	"	"		8 6A) 8 6B)	(P) —	0-01-0	5	"	"	"	"	8	6A(P)	—	0-01-0	
1	Khar Kopar	Alibag	Raigad	40	0(P)	—	0-14-0	1	Khar Kopar	Alibag	Raigad	40	1 (P)	—	0-14-0		
													40	2A (P)	—		
2	"	"	"	8	5A/1) 5A/2) 5A/3) 5A/4)	—	0-14-6	2	"	"	"	"	8	5A/1(P)	—	0-05-8	
													8	5A/2(P)	—	0-03-4	
													8	5A/3(P)	—	0-03-4	
													8	5A/4(P)	—	0-02-0	

[No. 34027/1/87-P.C.-III]
S. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer.

शहरी विकास मंत्रालय

(मुद्रण निदेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 1929

का.आ. 3202.—नासिक, कोयम्बतूर, कोरट्टी, अलीगढ़, नीलखेड़ी, संत्रागछी (हांवड़ा), मिंटो रोड, नई दिल्ली, रिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली, फरीदाबाद, गान्तोक में स्थित भारत सरकार मुद्रणालयों में कार्यरत अधिकारियों को सरकारी आवास आबंटन नियम 1972 के नियम 2 (बी) के अनुसरण में और जिसका विस्तार 25-1-80 की अधिसूचना सं. एस.ओ. 772 से मैसूर, भुवनेश्वर तथा चण्डीगढ़ स्थित भारत सरकार राज्य पुस्तक मुद्रणालय में किया गया के अनुसरण में मुद्रण निदेशक 1 जनवरी, 1990 से शुरू और 31 दिसम्बर, 1991 को समाप्त अवधि को अगले आबंटन वर्ष की अवधि के रूप में अधिसूचित करते हैं।

[सं. 52 (50)/87-प्रशा. 5/प्रशा. 4]

एस.एस. मेहरा, उप निदेशक (प्रशा. II)

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Directorate of Printing)

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1989

S.O. 3202.—In pursuance of Rule 2(b) of the Allotment of Government residence to officers employed in Government of India Presses located at Nasik, Coimbatore, Koratty, Ali-garh, Nilokheri, Santragachi (Howrah), Minto Road, New Delhi, Ring Road, New Delhi, Faridabad, Gangtok, Rule, 1972 and extended to Government of India Text Books Presses at Mysore, Bhubaneswar and Chandigarh vide notification No. S.O. 772, dated 25th January, 1980, the Director of Printing hereby notifies the period commencing on the 1st day of January, 1990 and ending on the 31st day of December, 1991, as the period of next allotment year.

[No. 52(50)/87-A. 5/A. IV]

S. S. MEHRA, Dy. Director (Admn. II)

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय

(संस्कृति विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 नवम्बर, 1989

का.आ. 3203.—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 9 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय पुरातत्व सर्वेक्षण, हैदराबाद के अधीक्षण पुरातत्वविद, श्री ए.पी. सागर को 1 दिसम्बर, 1989 से अगले आदेशों तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड, हैदराबाद के अपर क्षेत्रीय अधिकारी के पद का कार्यभार संभालने का भी निदेश देती है।

[सं. 805/44/87-एफ.सी.]

मनमोहन सिंह, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Culture)

New Delhi, the 30th November, 1989

S.O. 3203.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (ii) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952, (37 of 1952) read with Rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government hereby directs that Shri A. P. Sagar, Superintending Archaeologist, Archaeological Survey of India, Hyderabad will also perform the

functions of Additional Regional Officer of the Central Board of Film Certification at Hyderabad with effect from December 1, 1989, until further orders.

[No. 801/44/87-FC]

MANMOHAN SINGH, Jt. Secy.

शुद्धिपत्र

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.आ. 3204.—चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 (1) और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 3 के उप-नियम (1) और (2) के साथ पठित नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा यह निदेश देती है कि दिनांक 9-11-89 की समसंख्यक राज-पत्रित अधिसूचना में क्रम सं. 17 पर, बंगलूर स्थित केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के क्षेत्रीय सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य का नाम "श्री बी.एन. शान्तिप्पा" पढ़ा जाए।

[सं. 814/2/88-एफ.सी.]

अंशु वैश्य, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1989

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 3204.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) and sub-rule (3) of Rule 7, read with sub-rule (1) and (2) of Rule 3 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government hereby directs that the name of the member of the Regional Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification at Bangalore, appearing at S. No. 17 in the Gazette Notification of even number dated 9th November, 1989, be read as "Shri B. N. Shanthappa".

[No. 814/2/88-FC]

ANSHU VAISH, Director

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 दिसम्बर, 1989

का. आ. 3205.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 33.क के अंतर्गत श्री राम सरण गोप द्वारा निवा कोलियरी में लर्ज ईस्टर्न कोल फील्डज लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कनकता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 27-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 4th December, 1989

S.O. 3205.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in respect of a complaint u/s. 33A of the said Act filed by Sri Ram Sarap Gope, Pit Clerk, Ningah Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., PO-Kalipahari, Distt. Burdwan against—(i) The Agent, Ningah (R) Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., PO Kalipahari, Distt. Burdwan, and (ii) The Manaegr, Ningah Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Distt. Burdwan, which was received by the Central Government on 27th November, 1989.

Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Distt. Burdwan, which was received by the Central Government on 27th November, 1989.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA

Misc. Application No. 1 of 1984 U/S. 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Reference No. 61 of 1982)

PARTIES :

Sri Ram Sarap Gope, Pit Clerk, Nuigah Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Dist. Burdwan. Applicant.

—Vs—

(1) The Agent, Nuigah (R) Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Distt. Burdwan.

(2) The Manager, Nuigah Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Dist. Burdwan. Opp. Party.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Sukumar Chakravarty—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Applicant—None.

On behalf of Opp. Party—Mr. B. N. Lala, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

AWARD

This is an application under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

2. When the case is called out today, Mr. B. N. Lala, Advocate appears for the Opp. Party. Nobody appears for the applicant. Mr. Lala submits that in accordance with the direction of this Tribunal dated 8-9-1989 the notice dated 19th September, 1989 of this Tribunal was published in the newspapers "Awaz" at Dhanbad on 13th October, 1989 and "Asansol Katha" at Asansol on 15th October, 1989. Mr. Lala files the copies of the said newspapers and presses for the dismissal of the application as the applicant has not appeared in spite of the substitute service of the notice.

3. The application is pending from 1984. All steps including the substitute service of notice have been taken for enabling the applicant to appear but to no effect. In the circumstances the application under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is dismissed for default.

This is my Award.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 17th November, 1989.

SUKUMAR CHAKRAVARTY, Presiding Officer
[No. L-22013(2)/89-IR(C-II)]

नई दिल्ली, 6 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.सा. 3206 :— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1917 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूचन में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व मंस. ई.सी. लिम. की चाइनाकुरी नं. 3, पिट्स कोलियरी के प्रवर्धन से संबंधित नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक

विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 29-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 6th December, 1989

S.O. 3206.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chinakuri No. 3, Pits Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 29-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL ASANSOL

Reference No. 10/89

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Chinakuri 3 Pits Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Sunderchak, Dist. Burdwan.

AND

Their workman

PRESENT :

Shri N. K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Sri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workman—Sri C. D. Dwevedi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal STATE : West Bengal

Dated the 22nd November, 1989

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-22012(97)88-D. IV(B) dated the 17th January, 1989

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Chinakuri No. 3 Pits Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd., P.O. Sunderchak, Dist. Burdwan in not making the payment to Sri Sana Mondal, Lamp Checker for the period 01-07-1986 to 16-12-1986 is justified. If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?”

2. During the pendency of the case, on 21-11-89 Sri C. D. Dwevedi, Advocate representing the union filed a petition signed by the Vice President of the

union submitting therein that the concerned union is no longer interested to pursue the instant matter. In the petition the union also prayed for a 'no dispute' award in this case. Shri B.N. Lala, Advocate representing the management has no objection in this regard.

Upon consideration of the petition and the submission of the parties this Tribunal has no other alternative but to pass a 'no dispute' award and accordingly a 'no dispute' award is passed.

This is my Award.

N. K. SAHA Presiding Officer
[No. L-22012(97)/88-D.IV.B/IR(C. II)]

का.प्र. 3207 :- औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व मैसर्स ई.सी. लिम., बॉन्जेमहारी कोलियरी सालनपुर, गुर्खा के प्रबन्धन से संबंधित निर्यात और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसंसोल के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-11-89 प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3207.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal, Asansol-4 as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bonjemihari Colliery under Salanpur Area of M/s. E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL ASANSOL

Reference No. 59/88

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bonjemihari Colliery of M/s. E.C. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT :

Shri N.K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—None.

For the Workmen—None.

INDUSTRY : Coal. STATE : West Bengal.

Dated the 17th November, 1989

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012/21/88-D.IV(B) dated the 2nd August, 1988.

The Schedule

"Whether the action of Bonjemihari Colliery under Salanpur Area of M/s. E. C. Ltd., P.O. Raghunathchak, Dist. Burdwan in denying protection of wages/facilities to the workmen as mentioned in Annexure-A while proposing them to transfer to other Areas of the Company or to deploy/convent them as Truck Wagon Loaders award is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?"

2. The Reference was received on 5-8-88 and 23-8-88 was fixed for submission of written statement. Notice was issued upon all the parties. The acknowledgement showing service upon CITU Union of Asansol came back from which it appears that notice was received by the said union on 13-8-89. The A.D. cards of other notices did not come back and the notices are also not returned to this end. None appeared on 23-8-88. So 13-9-88 was fixed for appearance of parties, but none appeared. So 30-9-88 was fixed and fresh notices were issued. On 22-9-88 the notice upon Colliery Mazdoor Union, Asansol was served and this union appeared on 30-9-88 and filed a petition for adjournment. The notice upon CITU Union was served on 21-9-88 but did not appear. On 2-11-89 Colliery Mazdoor Union (INTUC) again filed a petition for time. From the papers on record it appears that this union appointed Sri C.D. Dwevedi, Advocate to act on their behalf but Sri Dwevedi did not accept the brief. Sri Dwevedi to-day submits that he has no instruction from the union. In this way the case was dragged. On 6-6-89 registered notices were sent to the unions. Colliery Mazdoor Union appeared on 12-6-89 but ultimately did not take any action. Again registered notices with A.D. were sent to all the union to take action in the case but none appeared on the date fixed (20-10-89) though the registered notices were duly served upon all the union and the A.D. cards were received by this end.

3. So, considering the entire background of the present case as stated above, I find that the unions are no longer interested to contest the dispute. Accordingly I have no other alternative but to pass a 'no dispute' award in the case. So a 'no dispute' award is passed.

This is my award.

ANNEXURE-A

List of Coal Loader

1. Malikram No. 2
2. Manick Muchi
3. Ratan Mahato
4. Mehatar Keyat
5. Narad Das
6. Nanku Keyet

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 7. Dalo | 62. Sambhu Majhi |
| 8. Dhaniram | 63. Lakhan Majhi |
| 9. Agar Sai | 64. Paran Majhi |
| 10. Amaru Keyot | 65. Sanalal Majhi |
| 11. Makhu Majhi | 66. Lakhinda Majhi |
| 12. Kanta Bouri | 67. Parmay Majhi |
| 13. Hemanta Bouri | 68. Rabi Majhi |
| 14. Hitlal Bouri | 69. Padalal Majhi |
| 15. Parag Bouri | 70. Adalat Dome |
| 16. Kista Bouri | 71. Durjadhan B.P. |
| 17. Baghu Bouri | 72. Kartick Ram B.P. |
| 18. Sanatan Bouri | 73. Nathu Ram |
| 19. Kamal Bouri | 74. Paban Bouri No. 2 |
| 20. Maharaj Bouri | 75. Ratan Bouri |
| 21. Naru Bouri | 76. Kalassasi Bouri |
| 22. Atul Bouri | 77. Gokul Bouri |
| 23. Manu Ram | 78. Kalu Majhi |
| 24. Bharat Lal | 79. Baya Nahaka |
| 25. Sukdeo Das | 80. Dasarathi Sahu |
| 26. Bhatu Das | 81. Sudarsan Nahaka |
| 27. Samrath Ramnami | 82. Kashinah Goura |
| 28. Dulal Lohar | 83. Raghu Nahaka No. 1 |
| 29. Supal Much | 84. Gantai Nahaka |
| 30. Firathram | 85. Muchiram Goura |
| 31. Sahadeb Bouri No. 2 | 86. Shyam Nahaka |
| 32. Kumar Das | 87. Mari Punia |
| 33. Melaram Satnami | 88. Naru Das |
| 34. Gangaram Keyet | 89. Ganga Sethi |
| 35. Pitambar Das | 90. Nakul Nahaka |
| 36. Palton B.P. | 91. Sajan Majhji |
| 37. Rathu Keyet | 92. Dewashi Ram |
| 38. San Sai | 93. Somai Majhi |
| 39. Ramlal Satnami | 94. Hemlal Majhi |
| 40. Badri Prasad Chandra | 95. Seogopal Satnami |
| 41. Bhola Das | 96. Gajadhar B.P. |
| 42. Mantu Majhi | 97. Tara Bouri |
| 43. Fagu Bhuia | 98. Surendra Majhi |
| 44. Nepal Bouri | 99. Babulal Majhi |
| 45. Maga Bouri | 100. Raghu Mahanti |
| 46. Chatu Majhi | 101. Labanya Goura |
| 47. Gopal Bouri | 102. Kangali Nahaka |
| 48. Sahadeb Bouri No. | 103. Kanda Bartia |
| 49. Kala Bouri No. 2 | 104. Narayan Samantara |
| 50. Babulal Majhi | 105. P. Kashi |
| 51. Laberwar Majhi | 106. Ranka Palli |
| 52. Hiru Majhi | 107. Gundicha Mallick |
| 53. Sabaria Kowar | 108. Kriparam Satnami |
| 54. Siblal Majhi | 109. Sarjan Majhi |
| 55. Dhana Majhi | 110. Joy Pata |
| 56. Hakim Majhi | 111. D. Pharsha |
| 57. Jitram | 112. Yadhistir Nahaka |
| 58. Dhan Sai | |
| 59. Kartick Ram | |
| 60. Kailash Turi | |
| 61. Kuswa | |

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer.
 [No. L-24012(21)/88-D.IV.B/IR(C.H)]
 R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

का.अ. 3208:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व मैमर्से ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिम., संक्टरिया के प्रबन्धन में संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आयनमोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 29-11-89 प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3208.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Sanctoria and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 29-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL ASANSOL

Reference No. 38/88

PARTIES —

Employers in relation to the management of Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Sanctoria, D.O. Dishergarh, Dist. Burdwan.

AND

Their workman.

PRESENT :

Shri N.K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Sri B.N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workman.—Sri Jawahar Singh, Vice-President of the Union.

INDUSTRY: Coal. STATE : West Bengal.

Dated, the 22nd November, 1989.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(247)/87-D. IV (B) dated the 23rd March, 1988.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Sanctoria P.O. Dishergarh, Dist. Burdwan in not referring Sri Ram Piyare Ram, Security Guard CMD's Cash Office to the Medical Board for examination after the panel of Doctors who examined him reported that he was not fit to continue in his duty and thus depriving his dependent from

employment as per clause 9.4.3. of NCWA-III is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?”

2. During the pendency of the case, on 21-11-89 Sri Jawahar Singh, Vice-President of the concerned union filed a petition submitting therein that the concerned union is no longer interested to pursue the instant matter. In the petition the union has also prayed for a ‘no dispute’ award in his case. Sri B.N. Lala, Advocate representing the management has no objection in this regard.

Upon consideration of the petition and the submission of the parties, this Tribunal has no other alternative but to pass a ‘no dispute’ award and accordingly a ‘no dispute’ award is passed.

This is my award.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-24012(247)/87-D IV.B IR(C.II)]

का.अ. 3209:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व मैमर्से ई.सी. लिम., डामरा कोलियरी श्रीपुर एरिया के प्रबन्धन में संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आयनमोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 29-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3209.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Damra Colliery under Sripur Area of M/s. E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 29-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ASANSOL

Reference No. 60/88

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Damra Colliery under Sripur Area of M/s. E.C.Ltd.

AND

Their workman.

PRESENT :

Shri N. K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workman—Sri C. D. Dwevedi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY Coal. STATE : West Bengal.

Dated, the 22nd November, 1989

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause

(d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012/50/88-D. IV(B) dated the 4th August, 1988.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Management of Damra Colliery under Sripur Area of M/s. E.C. Ltd., P.O. Kalipahari, Dist. Burdwan in dismissing Sri Budhan Rabidas alias Budhan Das, U. G. Loader from service w.e.f. 29-3-1984 was justified? If not, to what relief the workman was entitled and from what date?”

During the pendency of the case, on 21-11-89 Sri C. D. Dwevedi, Advocate representing the union filed a petition signed by the Vice-President of the union submitting therein that the concerned union is no longer interested to pursue the instant matter. In the petition the union also prayed for a ‘no dispute’ award in this case. Sri B. N. Lala, Advocate representing the management has no objection in this regard.

Upon consideration of the petition and the submission of the parties, this Tribunal has no other alternative but to pass a ‘no dispute’ award and accordingly a ‘no dispute’ award is passed.

This is my award.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-24012(50)/88-D.IV-B/IR(C.II)]

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1989

का. आ. 3210.—यन: मैसर्स वाटगे पटेल ट्रांसपोर्ट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 517 ई. पून बंगलौर रोड कोल्हापुर, और इसकी समस्त भारत स्विन शाखाएं (इनके आगे जहाँ कहीं भी उक्त स्थापना शब्द का प्रयोग हो इन्से अभिप्राय उक्त स्थापना से है, ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) इसके आगे उक्त अधिनियम के नाम से निश्चित को धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) के अंतर्गत छूट प्राप्त करने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

यह केन्द्र सरकार की राय में उक्त स्थापना के कर्मचारियों के लिए तैयार किए गए भविष्य निधि नियमों में अंशदान की दर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 में उल्लिखित कर्मचारी अंशदान की दर से कम नहीं है तथा इनके कर्मचारियों को मिलने वाले भविष्य निधि लाभ उक्त अधिनियम तथा कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 (इसके आगे जहाँ कहीं भी स्कीम शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया है उससे अभिप्राय उक्त स्कीम से है) में उल्लिखित लाभों से किसी भी प्रकार से कम नहीं है जो इस वर्ग की स्थापनाओं में कार्यरत कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध है।

अब इसलिये उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा एक के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित शर्तों के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा उक्त स्थापना को उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के लागू होने से छूट प्रदान करती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापना में भविष्य निधि निर्याता केन्द्र सरकार के द्वारा समय-समय दिए गए निर्देश के अनुसार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) में उल्लिखित निरीक्षण के लिए मुविआएं प्रदान करेगा और ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभार की अंशदारी प्रत्येक माह की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के अन्दर करेगा।

2. नछूट प्राप्त स्थापनाओं के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिनियम और उनके अधीन सृजित उक्त स्कीम के अंतर्गत देय अंशदान के दर से स्थापना के भविष्य निधि नियमों के अंतर्गत देय अंशदान का दर किसी समय भी कम न होगा।

3. पेशगियों के मामले में छूट प्राप्त स्थापना की स्कीम कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 से कम द्दितकर नहीं होगी।

4. उक्त स्कीम में कोई भी संशोधन जो स्थापना के वर्तमान नियमों से अधिक लाभकारी है उन पर अपने आप लागू किया जाएगा। उक्त स्थापना के भविष्य निधि नियमों में कोई भी संशोधन क्षेत्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त की पूर्व अनुमति के बगैर नहीं किया जाएगा और जहाँ किसी संशोधन से उक्त स्थापना के कर्मचारियों के हित से प्रतिकूल प्रभावी होने की सम्भावना है वहाँ अपनी अनुमति देने से पूर्व, क्षेत्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, कर्मचारियों को अपने विचार प्रस्तुत करने का उचित अवसर देगा।

5. यदि स्थापना की छूट न दी जाती तो वे सभी कर्मचारी [जैसे उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2(च) में निश्चित किया गया है] जो सदस्य बनने के पात्र होते, सदस्य बनाए जाएंगे।

6. जहाँ एक कर्मचारी जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि (कानूनी) या किसी अन्य छूट प्राप्त स्थापना का पहले से सदस्य है, को अपनी स्थापना में काम पर लगाया जाता है तो नियोजता उसे निधि का तुरन्त सदस्य बनाएगा और ऐसे कर्मचारी के पिछले नियोजता के पास भविष्य निधि लेखे भौ संचयों को अंतरित कराने और उनके लेखे में जमा कराने की व्यवस्था करेगा।

7. केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त के द्वारा अथवा केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा जैसे भी मामला हो, समय-समय पर दिए गए निर्देशों के अनुसार भविष्य निधि के प्रबन्ध के लिए नियोजता न्यासी बोर्ड की स्थापना करेगा।

8. भविष्य निधि, न्यासी बोर्ड में निहित होगा जो अन्य बातों के होते हुए भविष्य निधि में आय के उचित लेखों और भविष्य निधि में अदायगियों और उनकी अभिरक्षा में शेषों के लिए कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि संगठन के उत्तरदायी होगा।

9. न्यासी बोर्ड कम से कम 3 माह में एक बार बैठक करेगा और केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर जारी किए गए मार्ग निदेशों के अनुसार कार्य करेगा। केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त को अधिकार होगा कि वह किसी अन्य योग्य लेखा परीक्षक से खातों की दुबारा लेखा परीक्षा कराए और ऐसे पुनः लेखा-परीक्षा के खर्च नियोजता वहन करेगा।

10. न्यासी बोर्ड द्वारा रखे गए भविष्य निधि लेखे अर्हता प्राप्त निष्पक्ष चाटर्ड अकाउन्टेन्ट द्वारा वार्षिक लेखा परीक्षा के अधीन होंगे। जहाँ आवश्यक समझा जाए, केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त को किनी अन्य अर्हता प्राप्त लेखा-परीक्षक द्वारा लेखों की पुनः लेखा परीक्षा कराने का अधिकार होगा और इस पर हुआ व्यय नियोजता द्वारा वहन किया जाएगा।

11. प्रत्येक वर्ष स्थापना के लेखा परीक्षित तुलन-पत्र के साथ लेखापरीक्षित वार्षिक भविष्य निधि लेखों की एक प्रति वित्तीय वर्ष की समाप्ति के छः माह के अन्दर क्षेत्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त को प्रस्तुत की जाएगी। इस प्रयोजन के लिए भविष्य निधि का वित्तीय वर्ष पहली अप्रैल से 31 मार्च तक होगा।

12. नियोजता प्रतिमाह भविष्य निधि के देय अपने कर्मचारियों के अंशदानों की आगामी माह की 15 तारीख तक न्यासी बोर्ड को अंतरित कर देगा। अंशदानों की विलम्ब से अदायगी करने के लिए समान परिस्थितियों में नियोजता नुकसानी देने का उसी प्रकार उत्तरदायी होगा जिन प्रकार एक न छूट प्राप्त स्थापना उत्तरदायी होती है।

13. न्यासी बोर्ड सरकार द्वारा समय-समय दिए गए निदेशों के अनुसार निधि में जमा राशियों का निवेश करेगा। प्रतिभूतियाँ न्यासी बोर्ड के नाम पर प्राप्त की जाएँगी और भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के जना नियन्त्रण में अनुमूचित बैंक की अभिरक्षा में रखा जाएगा।

14. सरकार के निदेशों के अनुसार निवेश न करने पर न्यासी बोर्ड अलग-अलग रूप से और एक साथ केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त या उसके प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा लगाए गए अधिक प्रभार का उत्तरदायी होगा।

15. न्यासी बोर्ड एक वस्तु-व्यौरा रजिस्टर तैयार करेगा और व्याज और विमोचन आय का समय पर वृद्धि सुनिश्चित करेगा।

16. जमा किए गए अंशदानों, निकाले गए और प्रत्येक कर्मचारी से संबंधित व्याज को दिखाने के लिए न्यासी बोर्ड विस्तृत लेख तैयार करेगा।

3524 GI/89—7

17. वित्तीय/लेखा वर्ष की समाप्ति के छः माह के अन्दर बोर्ड प्रत्येक कर्मचारी को वार्षिक लेखा विवरण जारी करेगा।

18. बोर्ड प्रत्येक कर्मचारी को वार्षिक लेखा विवरण के स्थान पर पासबुक जारी कर सकता है। ये पास-बुक कर्मचारियों की अभिरक्षा में रहेंगी और कर्मचारियों के प्रस्तुतीकरण पर बोर्ड के द्वारा इन्हें अद्यतन किया जाएगा।

19. लेखा वर्ष के पहले दिन आदि शेष पर प्रत्येक कर्मचारी के लेखों में व्याज-उस दर से जमा किया जाएगा जिसका न्यासी बोर्ड निर्णय करे परन्तु यह उक्त स्कीम के पैरा 60 के अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा घोषित दर से कम नहीं होगा।

20. यदि न्यासी बोर्ड केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा घोषित व्याज की दर इस कारण से कि निवेश पर आय कम है या किसी अन्य कारण से अदा करने में प्रारम्भ है तो इस कमी को नियोजता पूरा करेगा।

21. नियोजता भविष्य निधि की चोरी के कारण लूट खसोट खानत, गबन अथवा किसी अन्य कारण से हुई हानि को पूरा करेगा।

22. नियोजता और न्यासी बोर्ड, क्षेत्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त को ऐसी विवरणियाँ प्रस्तुत करेगा जो समय-समय पर केन्द्रीय सरकार/केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त निर्धारित करें।

23. उक्त स्कीम के पैरा 69 की शर्तों पर किसी कर्मचारी को निधि के सदस्य न रहने पर यदि स्थापना के भविष्य-निधि नियमों में नियोजताओं के अंशदानों को जस्त करने की व्यवस्था है तो न्यासी बोर्ड इस प्रकार जस्त की गई राशियों का अलग में लेखा तैयार करेगा और उसे ऐसे प्रयोजनों के लिए उपयोग करेगा जो केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त की पूर्व अनुमति में सुनिश्चित किया गया हो।

24. स्थापन के भविष्य निधि नियमों में निर्दिष्ट किसी बात के होते हुए भी यदि किसी व्यक्ति की सेवा निवृत्ति होने के फलस्वरूप या किसी अन्य प्रतिष्ठान में तौकरो करने पर निधि की मदम्यता समाप्त हो जाती है वह पता लगता है कि प्रतिष्ठान के भविष्य निधि नियमों के अन्तर्गत अंशदान को दर समग्रहण की दर आदि संवित्थिक योजना के अन्तर्गत दी गई दरी की तुलना में कम अनुकूल है तो अन्तर का वहन नियोजता द्वारा किया जाएगा।

25. नियोजता, भविष्य निधि के प्रशासन से संबंधित सभी खर्च जिसमें लेखों के रखरखाव रिटर्न प्रस्तुत किए जाने, राशियों का अन्तरण शामिल है, वहन करेगा।

26. नियोजता समुचित प्राधिकारी द्वारा अनुमोदित निधि के नियमों की एक प्रति तथा जब भी कोई संशोधन होता है, उसकी मुख्य बातों को कर्मचारियों के बहुमत की भाषा में अनुवाद करके स्थापना के बोर्ड पर लगाएगा।

27. "समचित सरकार" स्थापना की चालू छूट पर और शर्तें लगा सकती हैं।

28. यदि उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत स्थापना वर्ग जिसमें उसकी स्थापना आती है, पर अंशदान की दर बढ़ायी जाती है, नियोजता भविष्य निधि अंशदान की दर उचित रूप में बढ़ाएगा, ताकि उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत दिए जाने वाले लाभों से स्थापना की स्कीम के अंतर्गत दिए जाने वाले भविष्य निधि के लाभ किसी भी प्रकार से कम न हों।

29. उक्त शर्तों में से किसी एक के उल्लंघन पर छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

[संख्या एस-35015 (20)/89-स. सु.-2]

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1989

S.O. 3210.—Whereas Messrs Ghatge Patil Transports (Private) Limited, 517-E, Pune-Bangalore Road, Kolhapur, including its branches all over India, (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) has applied for exemption under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas in the opinion of the Central Government the rules of the Provident Fund of the said establishment with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable to employees therein than those specified in section 6 of the said Act and the employees are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits which on the whole are not less favourable to the employees than the benefits provided under the said Act or under the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said scheme) in relation to the employees in any other establishment of a similar character;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the condition specified in the schedule annexed hereto the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall provide for such facilities for inspection and pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may from time to time direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 17 of said Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

2. The rate of contribution payable under the provident fund rules of the establishment shall at no time be lower than those payable under the said Act in respect of the unexempted establishment and the said Scheme framed thereunder.

3. In the matter of advances, the scheme of the exempted establishment shall not be less favourable than the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952.

4. Any amendment to the said scheme this is more beneficial to the employees than the existing rules of the establishment shall be made applicable to them automatically no amendment of the rules of the provident fund of the said establishment shall be made without the previous approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees of the said establishment, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall, before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

5. All employees [as defined in section 2(f) of the said Act] who would have been eligible to become members of the Provident Fund had the establishment not been granted exemption shall be enrolled as members.

6. Where an employee who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund (Statutory) or a Provident Fund of any other exempted establishment is employed in his es-

tablishment, the employer shall immediately enroll him as a member of the fund and arrange to have the accumulations in the provident fund account of such employee with his previous employer transferred and credited to his account.

7. The employer shall establish a Board of Trustees for the management of the provident fund according to such directions as may be given by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner or by the Central Government, as the case may be, from time to time.

8. The provident fund shall vest in the Board of Trustees who will be responsible for and accountable to the Employees' Provident Fund Organisation inter-alia for proper accounts of the receipts into and payments from the Provident Fund and the balance in their custody.

9. The Board of Trustees shall meet at least once in every three months and shall function in accordance with the guidelines that may be issued from time to time by the Central Government/Central Provident Fund Commissioner or an officer authorised by him.

10. The accounts of the Provident Fund maintained by the Board of Trustees shall be subject to audit by a qualified independent Chartered Accountant annually. Where considered necessary the Central Provident Fund Commissioner shall have the right to have the accounts re-audited by any other qualified auditor and the expenses so incurred shall be borne by the employer.

11. A copy of the audited annual provident fund accounts together with the audited balance sheet of the establishment for each accounting year shall be submitted to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner within six months after the close of the financial year. For this purpose the financial year of the provident fund shall be from the 1st of April to the 31st of March.

12. The employer shall transfer to the Board of Trustees the contributions payable to the Provident Fund by himself and the employees by the 15th of each month following the month for which the contributions are payable. The employer shall be liable to pay damages to the Board of Trustees for any delay in payment of the contributions in the same manner as an un-exempted establishment is liable under similar circumstances.

13. The Board of Trustees shall invest the monies in the fund as per directions that may be given by the Government from time to time. The securities shall be obtained in the name of the Board of Trustees and shall be kept in the custody of a Scheduled Bank under the Credit Central of the Reserve Bank of India.

14. Failure to make the investments as per directions of the Government shall make the Board of Trustees severally and jointly liable to surcharge as may be imposed by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner or his representative.

15. The Board of Trustees shall maintain a serial-wise register and ensure timely realisation of interest and ensure timely realisation of interest and redemption proceeds.

16. The Board of Trustees shall maintain detailed accounts to show the contributions credited, withdrawal and interest in respect of each employee.

17. The Board shall issue an annual statement of account to every employee within six months of the close of financial accounting year.

18. The Board may, instead of the annual statement of accounts, issue passbooks to every employee. These pass books shall remain in the custody of the employees and will be brought up to date by the Board on presentation by the employees.

19. The account of each employee shall be credited interest calculated on the opening balance as on the 1st day of the accounting year at such date may be decided by the Board of Trustees but shall not be lower than the rate declared by the Central Government under para 6b of the said Scheme.

20. If the Board of Trustees are unable to pay interest at the rate declared by the Central Government for the reason that the return on investment is less or for any other reason, than the deficiency shall be made good by the employer.

21. The employer shall also make good any other loss that may be caused to the Provident Fund due to theft, burglary, defalcation, mis-appropriation or any other reason.

22. The employer as well as the Board of Trustees shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner as the Central Government/Central Provident Fund Commissioner may prescribe from time to time.

23. If the Provident Fund rules of the establishment provide for forfeiture of the employees' contribution in cases where an employee ceases to be a member of the fund on the lines of para 69 of the said Scheme, the Board of Trustees shall maintain a separate account of the amounts so forfeited and may utilise the same for such purposes as may be determined with the prior approval of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner.

24. Notwithstanding anything contained in the provident fund rules of the establishment, if on the cessation of any individual, from the membership of the fund consequent on retiring from service or on taking up the employment in some other establishment, it is found that the rate of contribution, rate of forfeiture etc. under the provident fund rules of the establishment are less favourable as compared to those under the statutory scheme, the difference shall be borne by the employer.

25. The employer shall bear all the expenses of the administration of the Provident Fund including the maintenance of Accounts submission of returns, transfer of accumulations.

26. The employer shall display on the notice board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the fund as approved by the appropriate authority and as and when amended thereto alongwith a translation of the salient points thereof in the language of the majority of the employees.

27. The "appropriate Government" may lay down any further conditions for continued exemption of the establishment.

28. The employee shall enhance the rate of provident fund contributions appropriately if the rate of provident fund contribution for the class of establishments in which his establishment falls is enhanced under the said Act so that the benefits under the Provident Fund Scheme of the establishment shall not become less favourable than the benefits provided under the said Act.

29. The exemption is liable to be cancelled for violation of any of the above conditions.

[No. S-35015(20)/89-SS-II]

का.प्र. 3211:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (द) के उपखंड (vi) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के धर्म मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.प्र. 1418 दिनांक 15 मई, 1989 द्वारा किसी भी तेल क्षेत्र में सेवा को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 7 जून, 1989 से छह मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था; और केन्द्रीय सरकार भी राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छह मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है;

अतः अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (द) के उपखंड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 7 दिसम्बर, 1989 से छह मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम-11017/5/85-डी-1 (ए)]

S.O. 3211.—Where the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 1448 dated the 15th May, 1989 the service in any oil field to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months from the 7th June, 1989;

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further of six months from the 7th December, 1989.

[No. S-11017/5/85-D.I(A)]

का.प्र. 3212:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (द) के उपखंड (vi) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के धर्म मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.प्र. 1609 दिनांक 7 जून, 1989 द्वारा लौह अयस्क खनन उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 8 जून, 1989 से छह मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छह मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है;

अतः अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (द) के उपखंड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 8 दिसम्बर, 1989 से छह मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम-11017/12/85-डी-1 (ए)]

ए. के. भट्टारार्ज, भवर सचिव

S.O. 3212.—Where the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) declared by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 1609 dated the 7th June, 1989 the iron ore mining industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 8th June, 1989;

And, whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 8th December, 1989.

[No. S-11017/12/85-D.I(A)]

A. K. BHATTARAJ, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.प्र. 3213—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्तर रेलवे, बीकानेर डिब्रीजन के प्रबन्धतंत्र के सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1989

S.O. 3213.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Northern Railway, Bikaner and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 24-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 44/87

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Vigyan Singh S/o Muso Singh, C/o Qr. No. T-79-C,
Rly Loco Colony, Bara Hindu Rao, Delhi-110006.

Versus

1. The General Manager, Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. The Divisional Personnel Officer, Northern Railway, Bikaner Division, Bikaner.

APPEARANCES :

Shri Partap Rai—for the Workman.
Shri D. R. Seth—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Order No. L-41012/14/86-D. II(B) dated 22nd May, 1987 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Railway Management of Northern Railway, Bikaner Division in terminating the services of Shri Vigyan Singh w.e.f. 30-5-80 for alleged filing of wrong affidavit is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman entitled to ?"

2. Some of the undisputed facts are that the workman Shri Vigyan Singh was appointed as a casual Labour Gangman on 31-10-1977 under the PWI Delhi Sarai Rohilla Bikaner Division. The workman was given the CPC scale w.e.f. April, 1980. The services of the workman were terminated w.e.f. 15-7-1980 without any charge sheet or enquiry or payment of any retrenchment compensation.

3. The case of the workman is that he became entitled to the CPC scale of pay on completion of 120 days of service i.e. w.e.f. 21-3-1978 but was actually given the regular pay scale from April, 1980. Therefore, he had to file an application under section 33-C(2) of the I. D. Act before the Central Labour Court, New Delhi being LCA No. 168/81, for the recovery of arrears of wages for the period from 21-2-1978 to 21-2-1980 on ground of acquisition of temporary status and for the period from 14-6-1980 to 16-6-1981 on the ground of void ineffective and unjustified and illegal termination of his service. The Labour Court vide order dated 19-7-1985 allowed first part of the claim of the workman but turned down the second part of his claim on the ground that this claim could not be examined under section 33-C(2) of the I. D. Act. Hence the workman raised industrial dispute under section 10 of the I. D. Act. It is further submitted that the refusal of the employer to provide him with work on and from 14-6-1980 without any formal enquiry or show cause notice amounted to termination of services and as no retrenchment compensation was paid to him it was in contravention of section 25-F of the I. D. Act. He denied that he had submitted any false affidavit regarding his age and stated that he had submitted correct affidavit and the correct date of his birth is 1-2-1953 but the Management appeared to have been confused by the affidavit of Shri Sudhir Singh who is not the real son of workman. Sudhir Singh happened to be the son of his elder brother Thakur Singh who expired since long when Sudhir Singh was only a small child. As per the custom, the workman maintained both the mother and son and that is why Sudhir Singh called him as his father and under this misconception gave the name of workman as his father. This misconception and technical mistake of Sudhir Singh could not bind the workman and at any rate the mistakes affidavit of Sudhir Singh workman could not have been definitely used against the workman. Hence the workman prayed that his termination may be held to be void ab initio and non est in the eyes of law and he may be reinstated with continuity of service and with full back wages.

4. The Management filed a written statement which indicates its confused state of mind as to what defence it should take in this matter. On the one hand it was denied that the applicant's services were terminated and at the same time it has been submitted that the applicant was removed from service because of his giving wrong date of birth as 1-2-1953 in the face of the fact that his son Sudhir Singh gave his date of birth as 6-8-1958 meaning thereby that the workman was only 5 years 6 months and five days is older than his son which went to show that the date of birth of the applicant was wrong (pray, it may be asked, why the date of birth of Sudhir Singh may not be taken as wrong). It has further been stated that both the workman and his son filed

affidavit with regard to their date of birth. The workman was issued one month notice dated 3-5-1980 in this behalf for giving wrong date of birth by him but he did not give any reply/explanation to the said notice although it was duly received by him. Accordingly when no reply/explanation was received the Management had no alternative but to remove the applicant from service from 15-7-1980 after expiry of notice period. It has further been stated that the onus was on the workman to prove his date of birth as 1-2-1953 as correct, otherwise the Management had sufficient proof in the shape of two affidavits one given by Sudhir Kumar son of the workman and other by the workman himself. As no reply came from the workman the Management had no alternative but to remove the workman, from service and it was sufficient departmental enquiry in this case. It is only in the present industrial dispute that the workman has come forward to say that Sudhir Singh is not his real son but his brother's son whereas Sudhir Singh has clearly stated in his affidavit that the workman is his father.

5. There can be no two opinions that the allegation that the workman had submitted wrong affidavit in support of his age is a misconduct and also causes a stigma on the workman. In that event, it was incumbent on the Management to serve the workman with a charge sheet and to hold a domestic enquiry and also give the workman opportunity to defend himself. However, nothing of the sort was done. Both the affidavits of the workman and Sudhir Kumar were taken on their face value and an arbitrary inference drawn that the affidavit furnished by the workman was false. As has already been remarked earlier, another inference could also be drawn that the affidavit furnished by Sudhir Singh was incorrect. In any case, both the affidavits could not be correct factually because the workman could not have had a son at the age of 5-1/2 years. The proper course for the Management was to find out the truth of the matter and hold proper enquiry which it failed to do. It may also be noted that the affidavit of Sudhir Singh was not furnished by the workman and, therefore, the workman could not be accused of giving false age in his affidavit. The workman has examined W/W-2 Smt. Maya Devi who has described herself as the wife of Vigyan Singh workman. She has stated that Sudhir Singh is her real son born from the lions of Thakur Singh who was formerly her husband and after his death she got married to Vigyan Singh. Sudhir Singh was only 3 months old when Thakur Singh died. After the death of Thakur Singh Sudhir Singh was brought up by Vigyan Singh. The workman has stated that the said Thakur Singh was his real brother. There is no reason whatsoever to disbelieve the statement of Smt. Maya Devi. There is well known custom among jats of Punjab known as "Chadar Andazi" according to which on the death of the elder brother the younger brother takes his widow as his own wife and his children as his own children and looks after them. It appears that a similar custom is prevalent in district Bhagalpur Bihar to which the workman and the said Sudhir Singh belong. It has been argued by the Management that the DAR (Discipline & Appeal) rules were not applicable to the workman and, therefore, no enquiry could be held. In the first instance even if the DAR rules were not applicable, the rules of natural justice were applicable in this case. However, the contention of the Management that the DAR rules were not applicable to this workman are also incorrect. The paragraph 2511 of the Indian Railway Establishment Manual provides as under :

"2511. Rights and Privileges admissible to Casual Labour who are treated as temporary after completion of six months continuous services :—

- (a) Casual labour treated as temporary are entitled to all the rights and privileges admissible to temporary railway servants as laid down in Chapter XXIII of the Indian Railways Establishment Manual. The rights and privileges admissible to such labour also include the benefits of the Discipline and Appeal Rules. Their service, prior to the date of completion of six month's continuous service will not, however, count for any purposes like reckoning of retirement benefits, seniority etc. Such casual labourers will, also, be allowed to carry forward the leave at their credit

to the new post on absorption in regular service."

Not only this the Management in the case between Ram Kumar and others and C.O.U. and others 1989 II L.L.J. SC page 72 admitted that the benefit of discipline and appeal rules is also applicable to casual labour with temporary status. Under the circumstances, the termination of the services of the workman is bad in either case, whether by way of disciplinary action, as no proper enquiry under the DAR Rules was held and also being violative of the principles of natural justice and in case it was simple retrenchment, as no retrenchment compensation was paid and therefore, there is violation of the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act. Hence the termination of the workman is held to be void ab initio.

6. In view of the discussion made above, it is directed that the workman shall be reinstated with continuity of service. However, with regard to back wages, it may be observed that if the Management was at fault, the workman was not less at fault. On receipt of the notice dated 30-3-1989, it was his duty to explain the Management correct facts regarding his affidavit submitted by him and the affidavit submitted by his customary son Sudhir Singh. It is his silence that led the Management to take the action of terminating his service although his in violation of the principles of natural justice and the DAR rules. In the circumstances it is directed that back wages to the extent of 25% only may be paid to the workman. It is further directed that the amount of arrears shall be credited to the Provident fund account of the workman and if there is no provident fund account the amount may be deposited in any saving scheme of his choice of the National Saving Organisation. This reference stands disposed of accordingly.

21st November, 1989.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-41012/14/86-D. II (B)]

का.प्र. 3214:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) का धारा 17 के अनुवर्ण में, केन्द्रिय सरकार गन कार्रिज फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर के प्रबंधक के सम्बद्ध निवाजेको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुवर्ण में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रिय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रेषित करती है, जो केन्द्रिय सरकार को 23-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3214.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Gun Carriage Factory, Jabalpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-11-1989.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI V. N. SHUKLA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(7) of 1987

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Gun Carriage Factory, Jabalpur and their workman, Shri Arun Kumar Singhai, Family Welfare Centre, G.C.F. Hospital, Jabalpur, (M.P.).

APPEARANCES:

For Workman—Workman himself.

For Management—Shri A. K. Chaube, Advocate.

INDUSTRY: Ordnance Factory, DISTRICT: Jabalpur (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated, November 16, 1989

This is a reference made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, vide its Notification No. L-14012/18/86-D.II(B), dated 20th January, 1987, for adjudication of the following dispute:—

"Whether the action of the management of Gun Carriage Factory, Jabalpur (M.P.) in punishing Shri Arun Kumar Singhai, Family Welfare Extension Educator, Family Welfare Centre, G.C.F. Hospital, Jabalpur by orders dated 2-3-82, 11-4-84 and 26-9-85 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. Undisputed facts of the case are that the workman is a Family Welfare Extension Educator in Gun Carriage Factory, Jabalpur and is posted to Hospital (Family Welfare Centre). Under the Scheme launched by the Government, the following job are assigned to him:—

- (1) Mass Education.
- (2) Arrangement of Contraceptives.
- (3) Arrangement of Film shows etc.

3. It is also not disputed that on 11th January, 1982 the workman remained absent from duty from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. Though he had moved an application in this regard but he absented himself from duty without permission. Therefore disciplinary action under Rule 16 was initiated against him and after due enquiry a penalty of withholding one increment without cumulative effect for one year was imposed on him on 2-3-1982. It is also not disputed that on account of the incident took place on 9-2-1984 the workman was given penalty of Censure on 11-4-1984. It is also not disputed that the disciplinary authority vide Order No. 55118/85/V.O. dated 26-9-1985 imposed the penalty of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect for a period of two years.

4. The case of the workman in brief is that on 11-2-1982 he reported for duty as usual. While he was on duty he received an information regarding the death of his maternal grandfather. He therefore moved an application for grant of leave to attend the funeral of his maternal grandfather. As per C.C.S. (Leave Rules) 1972 and other Government orders an employee can take a short leave which would affect either deprivation of proportional amount of bonus, adjusted of a day's casual leave. He, however, remained on duty from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. and there was no exigency of service as no important or any specific job on that date was assigned to him which could have seriously affected the output or damaged the image of the factory. The penalty imposed is too severe in the circumstances and it is liable to be set aside.

5. That on 9-2-1984 an amount of Rs. 259.50 P. was paid to him on two different heads i.e. Rs. 78 towards Doctors fees and Rs. 181.50 P. for Celestic Band (Medicine) for payment. The job was assigned to him by the Lady Medical Officer. Though it was not a part of his duty but he obeyed the orders of his superior officers and made payment of Rs. 78 to the Doctor but the amount of Rs. 181.50 P. remained undischarged. He handed over this amount to the Lady Doctor. But the acknowledgement in writing was refused by her. This annoyed the Lady Medical Officer which resulted in false complaint by her and the disciplinary authority without going into the depth of the case awarded the penalty of Censure which is unjust and unwarranted and is liable to be set aside.

6. So far as the third case is concerned, the workman was assigned the duty of F.W.E.E. in the month of March 1985 prepared the Draft Factory Order for the whole month for high lights activities to improve the Annual performance and submitted to General Manager through Senior Medical Officer and Lady Medical Officer (Incharge F.W.C.) for approval and publication which was promulgated in Factory Order No. 179 dated 11-3-1985; though the Factory Order was published on 11-3-1985 but the programme drawn was to commence from 1st March, 1985 which was in progress accordingly.

7. On 11-3-1985 the workman was issued a letter by the Medical Officer, Incharge F.W.C. Hospital, that the Film Show on 14th and 21st March, 1985 be arranged. The workman was served with the letters No. 1390/M.O. dated 18-3-1985 by the Lady Medical Officer alleging that no Film Show was arranged on 14th March, 1985 and the workman should submit explanation within 24 hours. The workman submitted his explanation. Arrangement of film show by the Institution who possess Film and Project is made and for that specific order is given to ensure that the film show is made.

8. In the instant case, the workman was not specifically detailed for such purpose. Miscellaneous expenditure to be incurred were also not paid. Had the applicant been paid the amount and specifically detailed then in that case the applicant would have been held responsible if the show was

not done. Being not satisfied with the explanation the workman was charge-sheeted and on the basis that no representation having been received the workman was imposed penalty of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect for two years on 26-9-1985. It is illegal and is liable to be set aside.

9. According to the management, the workman did not mention the ground of taking leave from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. The ground is an after thought and the penalty of withholding of one increment without cumulative effect for one year is just and proper.

10. On 9-2-1984 at about 2 p.m. the workman misbehaved with Dr. Prabha Bikrol and threatened her for dire consequences during working hours. Therefore a Memorandum under Rule 16 of C.S.S. (CCA) Rules was issued and after consideration of his reply and evidence on record he was imposed minor penalty of censure.

11. During the Family Planning month the workman failed to perform the assigned duties and his performance was also poor. His short comings were informed on 8-4-1985 but he did not show any improvement, hence a Memo under Rule 16 was issued. Reminder was issued to him for submission of his representation. Opportunity was given to him to make representation but he did not submit any representation. The disciplinary authority after considering the evidence on record imposed the penalty of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect for two years on 26th September, 1985.

12. The case of the workman was also considered by the Regional Labour Commissioner, Jabalpur. The Factory is not an industry and therefore this Court has no jurisdiction to try this case. Hence the reference should be rejected.

13. The management in para 5 of its reply dated 27-3-87 contended that the employees of Ordnance Factories including G.C.F. Jabalpur are Central Civil Services personnel and that the establishment performing sovereign functions should be excluded from the purview of the term 'industry'. The management has relied on case of Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board Vs. A. Rajappa (AIR 1978 SC 969). To my mind, this very case decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 172 at page 973 has set the matter at rest and the Gun Carriage Factory is covered under the definition of 'industry' as defined in Sec. 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The relevant portion of the judgment in case of Water Supply and Sewerage Board (supra) is as under:—

"172. One of the exceptions carved out by the Court is in favour of activities undertaken by the Government in the exercise of its inalienable functions under the Constitution, call it regal, sovereign or any other name. I see no justification for excepting these categories of public utility activities from the definition of 'industry'.....

If the water supply and sewerage schemes or fire fighting establishments run by a Municipality can be industries, so ought to be the manufacture of coins and currency, arms and ammunition and the winning of oil and uranium. The fact that these latter kinds of activities are, or can only be, undertaken by the State does not furnish any answer to the question whether these activities are industries. When undertaken by a private individual they are industries. Therefore, when undertaken by the State, they are industries. The nature of the activity is the determining factor and that does not change according to who undertakes it. Items 8, 11, 12, 17 and 18 of the First Schedule read with section 2(n)(vi) of the Industrial Disputes Act render support to this view. These provisions which were described in Hospital Mazdoor Sabha (AIR 1960 SC 610) as 'very significant' at least show that, a conceivably, a Defence Establishments, a Mint or a Security Press can be an industry even though these activities are, ought to be and can only be undertaken by the State in the discharge of its constitutional obligations or functions. The State does not trade when it prints

a currency note or strikes a coin. And yet, considering the nature of the activity, it is engaged in an industry when it does so."

The above judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has further been explained by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur in M.P. No. 1969/83 Rajendra Naidu Vs. Union of India and two others. No other point in this regard has been raised by the management. I, therefore, hold that the Gun Carriage Factory is an 'industry' and Shri A. K. Singhai is a workman under the I.D. Act.

14. Coming to the merits of the case the workman has challenged the following orders under this reference:—

- (i) Order dated 2-3-1982 according to which the increment of the workman was withheld without cumulative effect for one year in case No. 281018/82/VO. (Ex. M/1).
- (ii) Order dated 11-4-1984 in case No. 442918/84/VO according to which the workman was censured (Ex. W/2).
- (iii) Order dated 26-9-1985 in case No. 551118/85/VO imposing the penalty of stoppage of one increments without cumulative effect for a period of two years. (Ex. M/9).

15. So far the case No. 281018/82/VO imposing penalty of withholding of one increment without cumulative effect for one year is concerned, it is based on the alleged misconduct of the workman to the effect that despite his short leave on 11-1-1982 from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. having not been granted due to exigencies of his services he left the hospital without permission. This fact can be gathered from Ex. M/1. According to the workman, he after making an application left the place of his duty on account of information received by him regarding the death of his maternal grandfather and he had to attend the last rites of his maternal grandfather. He has also pointed out that he was on duty right from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. and there was no exigency of his services when he left the hospital. According to him, the only fault he committed was that when he had moved application, he had not given the reasons for grant of leave and did not obtain the orders and had left the place of his duty, obviously without permission.

16. According to the management, the ground made out by the workman was an after thought. Whatever the fact may be Ex. M/2 discloses that he had expressed regret for his act and also pointed out the exceptional circumstances under which he had to leave the hospital for two hours i.e. from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. He has also pointed out that I/C, LMO/FWC were not available in the chamber and therefore he left his leave petition on his table and went to attend funeral function in good faith and impression that his short leave will not be objected to and will be sanctioned in usual manner.

17. The workman has also filed Ex. W/4 to show that the Senior Medical Officer had recommended for wage deduction for the period of absence in order to maintain discipline in the hospital. While considering the facts of this case it is patent that the penalty imposed on the workman was not only disproportionate to his alleged misconduct but harsh to a great extent. C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, Rule 11 provides punishment for such type of misconduct. In cases of such absence from work, the leave sanctioning authority may order that the days on which work is not performed be treated as "Dies Non" i.e. they will neither count as service nor be construed as break in service. It has further been expressed that this will be without prejudice to any other action that the competent authority might take against the persons resorting to such practices.

18. In the instant case, it is not the averment made by the management that the workman used to be absent from duty off and on or this was his practice.

19. The workman has explained the circumstances in which he had left the place of his duty and the management in its reply has not shown that there was any authority present to pass suitable orders on the application made by the workman. That being so, the penalty imposed in this case is liable to be set aside and is set aside, instead the period for which he was absent be converted into 1/2 day's

leave because the workman was on duty right from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. on 11-1-1982 and the management has failed to show the exigencies of work at the said period of time.

19. So far as the second case is concerned, the workman was charge-sheeted for misconduct on 9-2-1984 at about 2 p.m. to the effect that he misbehaved with Dr. Prabha Bikrol and threatened her for dire consequences during duty hours. Workman has not shown that there was any irregularity or illegality in the D.F. in regard to the alleged charge against him. He has come out with a different case altogether as pointed out in para 5 above. This case has not entered into the witness box to prove his case in this regard. The only grievance of the workman was that the charge was vague. I do not think that it is so. No other point was raised in this regard. The management has held that the alleged charge has been established against him (See Ex. M/7, Ex. M/8 and Ex. W/2).

20. In view of the above discussion, I am of the view that the penalty of Censure imposed upon the workman is neither unjust nor unwarranted. No interference is, therefore, called upon the penalty imposed on the workman in this regard.

21. So far as the third case is concerned, the main grievance of the workman is that he was not provided with the facilities as pointed out by him to perform duties entrusted to him. It was also said that the penalty imposed by the disciplinary authority are solely based on the ground that his representation was not received while he did submit his representation against the penalty sought to be imposed upon him. It was also said that the disciplinary authority did not go deep into the case. In support of his averment he has examined one Shri S. K. Mishra (W. W. 1) to show that the workman had made a representation but because the Senior Medical Officer was not present he returned it to the workman. He did not give him the acknowledgment for want of the direction of the Sr. M. O. This witness further says that at the request of the workman he again took back the letter and put it in the Tray. This is what is the evidence in regard to submitting his representation. In D. E. cases representations are not only taken on record but when submitted otherwise they are entered into the Dak Book. This witness has proceeded under assumption that his representation must have been received by the authority concerned (See Ex. M/9). There is no reason to disbelieve the management to hold that the management has not received any representation to the confidential Memo dated 30-4-1985 and reminder dated 1-7-1985. It follows that the workman had nothing to say as regards his gross misconduct and wilful neglect of duty, the details of which have been given in Ex. M/12.

22. The workman has not come forward before the Court in support of his case as detailed in paras 6 and 7 above.

23. In this view of the matter when no other point was raised to challenge the enquiry held against him in regard to gross misconduct and wilful neglect of duty, this Court has no ground to interfere in the finding in regard to this case No. 551118/85/VO.

24. I have gone through all the documents Ex. W/1 to Ex. W/5 as also all the documents Ex. M/1 to Ex. M/12 filed by the management. I, therefore, uphold the finding of the departmental enquiry in regard to gross misconduct and wilful neglect of duty on the part of the workman. But so far as the quantum of penalty is concerned it is reduced to withholding of increment for one year without cumulative effect.

25. I therefore answer the reference as follows :—

- (i) Punishment awarded by the management vide order dated 2-3-1982 to the workman is set aside.
- (ii) Punishment awarded to the workman vide Orders dated 11-4-1984 and 26-9-1985 is upheld but the punishment imposed vide order dated 26-9-1985 for stoppage on one increment without cumulative effect for a period of two years is reduced for a

period of one year instead two years without cumulative effect.

Award is given accordingly. No order as to costs.

V. N. SHUKLA, Presiding Officer.
[No. I-14012/18/86-D. II (B)]

का.प्र. 3215 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 11) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार खादीग्राम उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धन के सम्बन्ध में निदेशों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3215.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Khadi Gram Udpug Bhawan, New Delhi and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-11-89.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI G.S. KALRA: PRESIDING OFFICER:
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10/87

In the matter of dispute between :
Shri Kashi Nath Seth,
Through The General Secretary,
Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan,
Karamchari Sangh Regal Building,
New Delhi.

Versus

The Manager,
Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan,
Karamchari Sangh Regal Building,
New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri Jog Singh with the workman.
Shri Sammeer Parkash for the management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. I-42012/56/85-D.II(B) dated 22nd January, 1987 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan, New Delhi to recover the full amount of Rs. 1900 alleged to have been found short from the cash from the pay of Shri Kashi Nath Seth is justified ? If not, to what relief, the workman is entitled to ?”

2. Shri Kashi Nath Seth workman has been in service of the Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan, Regal Building, New Delhi for the last about 27 years. On 25-2-81 the workman was performing the duties of a Cashier. At about 12 noon on that day an accident took place in which two foreigners are alleged to have entered the cabin of the workman and made away with Rs. 1900. The workman gave in writing to the Management that facts and circumstances under which the occurrence had taken place and the Management lodged a report with the police on that very day and the police also arrived at the premises of the Management shortly thereafter. On 30th March, 1981 a charge sheet was served upon the workman with the following charges :

“1. Shri Kashi Nath Seth, Salesman-III is charged for being negligent in the performance of his duties

while working as Cashier on 25-2-1981 in the Sales Section of Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan, New Delhi.

II. Shri Kashi Nath Seth, Salesman-III is also charged for not discharging his duties with promptitude on 25-2-1981 while working as Cashier in the Sales Section of Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan, New Delhi.

III. Shri Kashi Nath Seth is charged for causing loss of Rs. 1900 (Rupees One Thousand Nine Hundred only) to the Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan, New Delhi.

A domestic enquiry was conducted and the enquiry officer submitted his report in which the charges were found to have been proved against the workman. The order of the Management passed the order dated 23-1-84 that the sum of Rs. 1900/- may be recovered from the workman in suitable instalments. The workman filed an appeal dated 25-4-84 against the said order and the same was rejected vide order dated 30/31-7-84. Thereafter the workman raised an industrial dispute and the matter ended in failure before the conciliation machinery and that is how this reference is before this Tribunal.

3. The case of the workman is that he has been victimised by the Management due to his trade Union activities; that the charges against him were groundless and that a promanagement report has been obtained from the enquiry officer to hide the weakness and carelessness of the Management relating to security arrangements in its premises and that the evidence which proved his innocence has been ignored by the Enquiry Officer and per-verse and biased report had been submitted by him. He therefore, prayed that the order imposing penalty on him may be set aside and the amount recovered from him may be refunded to him alongwith interest and costs.

4. The Management controverted the claim and allegations of the workman and asserted that the enquiry conducted against the workman is legal and fair and proper and the order passed by it is valid and legal. It further submitted that the charge of negligence of duty was proved against the workman concerned as the workman did not take due precaution to safeguard cash of the Management. He did not take necessary precautions as per the procedure. He had to deposit the sale proceeds of the previous day with the bank on the following day but he had not deposited the same although he had prepared the slip. Instead of keeping the cash in the drawer duly locked, he kept the cash on the counter. Neither he made quick alarm nor he tried to catch hold of the person concerned. It was quite unbelievable that such incident could occur in a day time when about 80 to 90 employees are working and in addition to it about 150 to 200 customers are always making purchases. The report was lodged with the police on the basis of information given in writing by the workman. It was denied that it was incident of loot as alleged.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the entire facts and circumstances of this case and I am of the opinion that all the charges against the workman are groundless and there was no sufficient material on the basis of which the charges could have been framed against workman and consequently the entire exercise of domestic enquiry and passing of order of penalty are vitiated. The first thing to be noted is that the Management is labouring under certain unreasonable and unnatural conceptions. One such misconception is its belief that such an incident could not have occurred at day time when about 80 to 90 members of Staff and 150 to 200 customers were present. There have been instances of robberies in banks and other establishments where such acts have been committed when even thousands of persons were present. The second thing to be noted is that soon after the incident the Management lodged a report with the police in which it was clearly mentioned that two foreigners had committed robbery of Rs. 1900 from the cash counter of the workman

and that on the information having been given the police also arrived at the spot at about 12.15 P.M. and it was further prayed that the culprits may be arrested and action taken against them. It is, therefore, apparent that immediately after the incident the Management had accepted the fact that it was a case of robbery and there was no fault on the part of the workman. The version given by the workman has been quoted in the F.I.R. verbatim and therefore, it is to be presumed that it was accepted by the Management as correct. It is only subsequently that the Management appears to have had second thoughts about the incident and decided to frame a charge sheet against the workman. The reason for this change in heart of the Management is not far to seek because the workman is admitted to be an office bearer of the Khadi Gramodyug Bhavan Karamchhari Sangh and it appears that the Management thought it to be a good opportunity to settle some score with the workman because of his Union activities. Thirdly, all the witnesses, both of the Management as well as of the defence, have stated with one voice that immediately after the occurrence the workman raised an alarm and Shri Malkhani, Chand Kapoor and Satvavan Sharma ran after those foreigners who had committed the robbery but could not nab them. Therefore, the allegations contained in the charge sheet are clearly baseless. Fourthly Shri Satvavan Sharma as Management witness has stated that there is no door at the entry to the counter of the workman and anybody can enter the counter and that he himself had mentioned to the Manager about the insecure arrangement for the counter and that the Manager had assured him that a door will be provided by calling the Carpenter but this could not be done as the Carpenter did not reach there. It is also admitted that there is a urinal and a trial room near the cash counter of the workman. How the Enquiry Officer has completely ignored all these patent facts about the cash counter and the occurrence. He has not taken into consideration the fact that Management itself had lodged a report with the police on the basis of the information furnished by the workman and asked the police to nab the culprits who had robbed the Management of Rs. 1900/-. The Enquiry Officer has also ignored the statements of the witnesses that the workman had raised an alarm with alacrity and the three officers of the Management ran after the culprits but could not find them. The Enquiry Officer has not given any reason even for not accepting this evidence of the witnesses. The enquiry officer has advanced a specious argument that the workman was negligent in as much as he had kept the money on the counter and not in the drawer under lock and key but he has ignored the admitted fact that the workman was counting the money for lodgement with the bank and in fact had prepared the statement of lodgement which is on record. Now the workman has given very reasonable and rational explanation that the money which was to be lodged with the bank could not have been counted in the drawer and had to be taken out for counting. The Enquiry Officer has also not taken into account the inadequate arrangement made for security of cash counter in as much as there was no door to the entry and anybody could enter the counter and that is exactly what has happened when those two foreigners entered the cash counter and committed the robbery. It was, therefore, a case of negligence on the part of the Management rather than on part of the workman. The Enquiry Officer has also not taken into account the fact that the foreigners who had presented a bill of Rs. 9/- to the workman had not collected the goods purchased by them and left the premises of the Management. Therefore, it is a misstatement on the part of the Management to say that it was not case of robbery. All these facts clearly go to show that the enquiry officer has not acted in a judicial manner which he was expected to do and his report is biased and perverse. There is no question of allowing the Management to produce evidence to prove the charges before this Tribunal because the very charges are groundless and the Management cannot make any improvement on the facts which stand out. It is held that the entire proceedings of the Management are vitiated and the order passed for recovery of amount from the workman is illegal and invalid.

6. In view of the discussion made above, the Management as directed to refund within one month of the enforcement of the award the sum of Rs. 1900/- to the workmen alongwith interest @ 12% per annum alongwith cost of Rs. 500/-. In case of default in making payment within the stipulated period the workman shall be entitled to future interest @ 15% per annum. This reference stands disposed of accordingly.

Dated 8th November, 1989.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-42012/56/85-D.II(B)]

HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.प्र. 3216:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम, बम्बई के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बम्बई के पंचपद को प्रकाशित करती है।

New Delhi, the 6th December 1989

S.O. 3216.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Industrial Tribunal, Bombay as shown in the annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay and their workmen.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I AT BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. S. Jamdar, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-47 of 1987

PARTIES :

Employer in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay.

and

their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management.—Mr. A. W. Dharwadkar, Advocate.

For the workmen.—Mr. A. S. Deo, General Secretary, Insurance Employees' Association.

INDUSTRY : Insurance STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, dated the 17th day of August, 1989

AWARD

The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of section 10 of the Industrial Dis-

putes Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay Division, in accepting the date of birth of Shri B. H. Dhuri as 24-4-1928 as justified ? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen is entitled to ?”

2. Shri Dhuri joined the erstwhile Vishwa Bharati Insurance Company Limited on 12-4-1953. At that time on the basis of his horoscope his birthdate was recorded as 24-4-1928. After nationalisation of the Life Insurance business and establishment of the L.I.C. on 1st September, 1956, the Corporation sought the bio-data of every employee in the prescribed form and at that time Shri Dhuri gave his birth date as 14-4-1929.

3. The L.I.C. of India, framed LIC (Staff) Regulations, 1960 under S. 49 of the Life Insurance Corporation of India Act, 1956, defining the terms and conditions of service of the staff of the corporation. Regulation 19 of the said regulation provides for superannuation and retirement. Clause 1 of regulation 19 stated that an employee belonging to class-III or class-IV shall retire on completion of age 60.

4. In exercise of the powers conferred by Regulation 4, the chairman issued instructions, for verification of the date of birth of employees of the Corporation, which are known as Life Insurance Corporation of India (Verification of the date of birth of employees) Instructions, 1970. As per these instructions Shri Dhuri gave his date of birth as 15-11-1929 and produced his school leaving certificate and a letter from the Tehsildar in proof of his claim. The Senior Divisional Manager, Bombay returned these documents to Shri Dhuri and informed him by letter dated 6th March, 1978 that his date of birth was admitted by the Central Office as 24-4-1928, on the basis of his horoscope.

5. According to the workman, the Corporation, having called upon him to tender proof of his date of birth was bound to accept as correct the date mentioned in the school leaving certificate issued by a renowned school through which he passed his S.S.C. Examination and ignored the horoscopes. For two reasons this submission cannot be accepted.

6. Firstly because it is not disputed that the date of birth was recorded in his service record as 24-4-1928 on the basis of the horoscope produced by him as proof of his age. It was never his case that the date of birth given in the horoscope is wrong. Neither in his representations to the management nor in his statement of claim he averred that the date of birth given in the horoscope is wrong. He did not step in the witness box to say so on oath.

7. Secondly ‘horoscope’ is also recognised as a ‘listed document’, on the basis of which the corpora-

tion can validly record the date of birth of an employee. Clauses (1) and (2) of instruction no. 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation of India (verification of date of birth of employees) instructions, 1970 which lay down how the age of an employee is to be entered into the record read as follows :—

“1. The date of birth of every employee of the Corporation shall be entered in the staff record by an order duly made in accordance with the provisions of these instructions.

2. No order for entry shall be made except on the basis of a listed document relating to the employee concerned and unless the document demonstrably pertains to the employee and the authority passing the order is satisfied that it is the most authentic, it has not been tempered with and it can be relied upon, that it shows the correct date of birth of the employee.”

8. The term listed document is defined by clause (i) of instruction no. 3 as meaning a document specified in the First Schedule of the instructions. An ‘original horoscope prepared soon after birth’ is mentioned at serial no. 9 of the First Schedule. As mentioned above it was never the case of Shri Dhuri that the horoscope tendered by him was not prepared soon after his birth and hence may not be correct. No doubt the school leaving certificate is also one of the listed documents. But the entry in the school Register is made on the basis of the information supplied at the time of admission. There is nothing to show that the entry in the Register of the first school in which Shri Dhuri was admitted was based on any official record. The concerned Competent Authority of the Corporation was therefore perfectly justified in confirming the original date as recorded in the service record of Shri Dhuri, on the basis of the horoscope tendered by him. The fact that the corporation chose to verify the date of birth of Shri Dhuri does not mean that the date of birth as recorded was wrong and the Corporation called upon Shri Dhuri to produce documentary proof to correct it. The verification was done in respect of every employee, as per the above-mentioned instructions. It cannot therefore be contended that as the workman was directed to produce documentary proof for verification of his age, the Corporation was bound to ignore the horoscope and prefer other listed document produced by the employee.

9. Further even according to Shri Dhuri, after the formation of the Corporation Shri Dhuri was asked to furnish his bio-data. It means that his date of birth was verified after 1st September, 1986. Hence in view of Instruction 4(3) the entry in the service record will be deemed to have been made under the 1970 instructions by Competent Authority. Instruction 4(3) reads as follows :—

“Where, as on the date of these Instructions, an entry has been made on a verification carried out on or after 1st September 1956

either on the basis of any of the proofs specified in Entry Nos. 1, 2 or 3 of the First Schedule or after examining such proofs but accepting any other listed document, such entry shall be deemed to have been made under these Instructions by an order of the competent authority.”

10 In the result therefore the action of the L.I.C. in accepting 24-4-1928 as the date of birth of Shri B. H. Dhuri was justified and the said workmen would not be entitled to any relief. Award accordingly.

M. S. JAMDAR, Presiding Officer

[No. L-17012(15)/87-D.IV(A)/IR(Bank-I)]

नई दिल्ली, 7 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.मा. 3217.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूचन में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम, अजमेर के प्रबन्धतन्त्र के संवद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुसूचन में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधि-करण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है।

New Delhi, the 7th December, 1989

S.O. 3217.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Govt. hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corp. of India, Ajmer and their workman.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 54/89

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Sunil Singhal, Rakhi House Near Sandon-
Ki-Pole, Jodhpur.

Versus

Sr. Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corpo-
ration of India, Jeevan Parkash P.B. No. 2,
Ajmer.

APPEARANCES :

None for the workman.

Shri S. K. Nanda, Assistant Admn. Officer for
the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-17011/3/89-IR(Bank I) dated 24-5-89 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Ajmer in terminating the services of Shri Sunil Singhal ex-assisant w.e.f. 1-5-87 and not offering him regular employment is just and fair ?

If not, to what relief is the concerned worker entitled and from what date?"

2. The workman did not file any statement of claim and other documents as directed in the order of reference within the stipulated period. Even the workman has not cared to put in appearance in spite of registered notices sent by this Tribunal.

3. The Management has placed on record its letter dated 25-9-89 intimating that the workman Shri Sumil Singhal has been appointed in LIC in their Ajmer Division and is now their employee and his grievance has been redressed. It appears that it is because the workman has been given employment by the LIC that he is no more interested in pursuing this dispute. Hence No Dispute award is given and this reference is disposed of accordingly.

26th October, 1989.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-17011/3/89-IR(Bank-I)]

PADMA VENKATACHALAM, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.आ. 3218.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, ठेका श्रम (विनियमन और उद्घाटन) अधिनियम, 1970 (1970 का 37) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) तारीख 1-6-85 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2425 का भागतः उपांतरण करते हुए, नीचे की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार का राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, रजिस्ट्रीकर्ता अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या इसके अधीन ऐसे रजिस्ट्रीकर्ता अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा जो अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिकारिता रखता है।

अनुसूची

अधिकारी (1)	अधिकार क्षेत्र (2)
श्रम प्रवर्तन अधिकारी (केन्द्रीय), पोर्टब्लेयर	अंदमान और निकोबार द्वीप

[एस. 16014/26/87/एल. डब्ल्यू. (i)]

New Delhi, the 8th December, 1989

S.O. 3218.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (37 of 1970) and in partial modification of the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. 2425 published on 1st June, 1985 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Schedule below, being Gazetted Officer of the Government, to be the registering officer who shall exercise the powers conferred on registering officers by or under the said Act, having jurisdiction as specified in column (2) of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Officers (1)	Jurisdiction (2)
Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Port Blair.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

(No. S. 16014/26/87-LW(ii))

का.आ. 3219.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, ठेका श्रम (विनियमन और उद्घाटन) अधिनियम, 1970 (1970 का 37) की धारा 11 का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii), तारीख 1-6-1985 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2424 का भागतः उपांतरण करते हुए, नीचे की अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार का राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, अनुसूचित अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या इसके अधीन ऐसे अनुसूचित अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा जो उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिकारिता रखता है।

अनुसूची

अधिकारी (1)	अधिकारी क्षेत्र (2)
श्रम प्रवर्तन अधिकारी (केन्द्रीय) पोर्टब्लेयर।	अंदमान और निकोबार (द्वीप)

[एस-16014/26/87/एल. डब्ल्यू. (ii)]

शशि भूषण, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3219.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 11 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (37 of 1970) and in partial modification of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S. O. 2424, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) on 1-6-1985, the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the schedule below, being Gazetted Officer of the Government to be licensing officer who shall exercise the powers conferred on licensing officers by or under the said having jurisdiction as specified in column (2) of the said schedule ;

SCHEDULE

Officers (1)	Jurisdiction (2)
Labour Enforcement Officer, (Central), Port Blair.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

[S. 16014/26/87-LW(ii)]

SHASHI BHUSHAN, Under Secy.

का.आ. 3220.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मंसूर भारत कोरिंगकोट लि. की ओर सविनय II की ओर मार्च म. सी. कोलियरी के

प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक प्रतिक्रिया, (सं. 2), धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-11-1989 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3220.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra North (U.G.) of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-11-1989.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)

AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri I. N. Sinha,
Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 241 of 1987

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra North (U.G.) Colliery of Bhowra Area XI of B.C.C. Ltd. and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri S. N. Goswami,
Advocate.

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. N. Prasad,
Advocate.

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 15th November, 1989

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(2)/87-D.IV(B) dated, the 13th August, 1987.

SCHEDULE

“Whether action of the Management of Bhowra (North U.G.) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. P.O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad in retiring Sri S. B. Chakravorty, Asstt. Foreman from service with effect from 1-1-1987 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Sri S. B. Chakravorty was appointed in the year 1947 in the erstwhile management of Bhowra North colliery. The said colliery was taken over in accordance with the provisions of Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 by BCCL. At the time of the appointment of the concerned workman his age was recorded and mentioned as 1929 in Form B Register and Form A register of C.M.P.F. account bearing No. C/43585. He was in continuous service till he was superannuated with effect from 31-12-86. The management had not gone through the original records namely Form B Register and C.M.P.F. account register in superannuating the concerned workman and issued a letter dated 27-6-86 superannuating him from the service of the company with effect from 1-1-87 although the concerned workman had not attained the age of 60 years. According to the records the concerned workman is to be superannuated with effect from 31-12-89. The management have manipulated and changed the date of birth of the concerned workman in their records without the knowledge of the concerned workman. The concerned workman made several representation for correction of the date of his birth. But the management did not correct his date of birth/age and superannuated him prematurely as stated above. There is glaring difference and discrepancy of the age/date of birth of the concerned workman between the original Form B Register and C.M.P.F. account register and the management's present Form B Register. In Form B Register and C.M.P.F. Account Register and Form A register the date of birth of the concerned workman has been mentioned as 1-1-1929 and accordingly he will attain the age of superannuation with effect from 1-1-89. The procedure for determination/verification of age of an employee of M/s. BCCL is stated in the letter of Koyala Bhawan dated 26/20-8-86 which states that wherever there is variation in the records and there is glaring and apparent wrong entry brought to the notice of the management, the management should take appropriate action for correction through age determination committee/medical board and that the decision of the age/determination committee/medical board will be binding and final. In spite of glaring difference and variation in the records regarding the age of the concerned workman the management neither got the age of the concerned workman determined by the age determination committee or the medical board. An industrial dispute was raised before the ALC(C), Dhanbad and on failure report being sent to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour the present reference was made to this Tribunal for adjudication. On the above facts it is prayed that it be declared that the date of birth of the concerned workman was 1-1-29 and accordingly the order of his superannuation be set aside and the concerned workman be reinstated with full back wages and be allowed to continue in the service till 31-12-89.

The case of the management is that the concerned workman was an employee of Bhowra (N) colliery and was working as Asstt. Foreman when he retired from the service of the company on 1-1-1987. According to the statutory Form B Register the date of appointment of the concerned workman was 12-5-47

and his date of birth as recorded in Form B Register was 1-1-1927. The concerned workman being a literate person had signed the entries in the Form B Register as token of acceptance of the entries made therein. The management issued identity card to the concerned workman in the year 1974 showing his date of birth as 1-1-1927 but at that time the concerned workman did not raise any objection regarding the date of his birth. The colliery management for the sake of convenience is maintaining a C.M.P.F. register in which also the date of birth of the concerned workman has been mentioned as 1-1-1927. In All the aforesaid record the date of birth of the concerned workman was the same there being no variation in the record age and as such it did not warrant any consideration for the determination of the age of the concerned workman. Only a few months prior to the due date of retirement the concerned raised the issue of correction of his date of birth which was not accepted by the management. The JBOCI had deliberated upon the age dispute and finally decided and formulated a guideline vide Implementation Instruction No. 37 through a letter dated 5-2-1981. The said Implementation Instruction stipulates that wherever there is no variation of record such cases will not be re-opened unless there is very glaring and apparent wrong entry brought to the notice of the management and the management being satisfied on the merit of the case will take appropriate action for correction through age determination committee/medical board. There is no variation in the records in the case of the concerned workman and there was no question of re-opening the matter of the determination of age of the concerned workman. Moreover there was no glaring and apparent wrong entry in as much as the concerned workman had put his signature in the relevant entries. The concerned workman was in full knowledge of his age/date of birth recorded in the management's record but he did not take any early step its rectification with necessary evidence. On the above facts it is submitted that the management had rightly superannuated the concerned workman with effect from 1-1-87. It is prayed therefore that the Award be passed in favour of the management.

The point for determination is whether the concerned workman has been rightly superannuated from service with effect from 1-1-1987. Under this head it has to be decided as to what was the date of birth/age of the concerned workman ?

The management examined 2 witnesses and the workmen examined one witness in support of their respective cases.

The management and the workman each exhibited documents which are marked Ext. M-1 to M-4 for the management and Ext. W-1 to W-4 for the workmen.

Admittedly, the Form B Register of the erstwhile management of the period when the concerned workman was appointed in Bhowra (N) Colliery has not been filed by management in this case. The manage-

ment however, has filed an extract photo copy of Form B Register marked Ext. M-1 which was prepared by BCCU after the take over of Bhowra (North) Colliery from the erstwhile management. MW-1 Shri H. K. Manatha who is a clerk in the personnel department and is working in Bhowra (North) colliery since 1971 has stated that this Form B Register of Bhowra (North) colliery was continuing from 1973 and that previously the date of birth of the concerned workman was not noted in this Form B Register. He has also stated that he had seen the original Form B Register of Bhowra (North) colliery. He has denied that the date of birth of the concerned workman was noted in the original Form B Register of the erstwhile management as 1-1-1929. He has also denied that the said date of birth of the concerned workman has been manipulated to make it 1-1-1927. It will also appear from his evidence that the age of the concerned workman was entered in the Form B Register Ext. M-1 on the basis of declaration made by the concerned workman before Dr. Forbeys of Bhowra Colliery hospital and that the said age declared by the concerned workman was accepted by the doctor. He has stated that Ext. M-2 is the paper by which the concerned workman declared his age and that it also contains his signature. Ext. M-2 is dated 7-6-1980 which shows that the concerned workman under his signature informed that his date of birth/age has not been declared in the P. F. records and identity card issued to him and that he attained the age of 53 years on 1-1-1980 which may kindly be entered in the records of the management. He further stated that his date of birth be entered as 1-1-27. MW-1 is the concerned workman and has accepted that Ext. M-2 bears his signature. MW-2 Shri R. J. Singh was working in Bhowra North Colliery from 1978 to April, 1984 in the personnel department. He has stated that the personnel department maintains the Form B Register of the identity card register of Bhowra (North) colliery. He further states that the date of birth of some of the workmen Bhowra (North) Colliery was not recorded in Form B Register and identity card register as such a committee was formed for determining the age of the workmen including the concerned workman whose age was not recorded in Form B Register. MW-2 himself was one of the member of the said committee. He has stated that Ext. M-2 is the declaration Form signed by the concerned workman who had submitted it before the said committee. He has stated that it contains the signature and the signature of the Shri S. C. Suneja and Dr. Bhattacharjee and Shri Prabesh who were members of the said committee Ext. M-2 shows the signature of the persons stated by MW-2. MW-2 has further stated that the age column against the name of the concerned workman was filled up on the basis of the declaration in Ext. M-2 and the said Form B Register is marked Ext. M-3 which is equivalent to Ext. M-1. Ext. M-4 is the extract photo copy of identity card register and according to MW-2 the date of birth entered against the name of the concerned workman in it is on the basis of the date of birth as recorded in Form B Register Ext. M-3. It is thus clear that there was no

entry of date of birth of the concerned workman at the time when the management prepared Form B Register in 1973 and that the age in Form B Register and identity card register was entered sometime after Ext. M-2 dated 7-6-1980. The original Form B Register of the erstwhile management has not been filed on the plea that it did not contain the date of birth or age of the concerned workman and therefore the date of birth of the concerned workman was blank in Form B Register prepared by BCCL and that the relevant entry regarding the date of birth of the concerned workman was mentioned sometime after the declaration of date of birth made by the concerned workman vide Ext. M-2 dated 7-6-80.

The workman have not filed any document in support of the fact that his date of birth/age was recorded as 1-1-1929. Even no oral evidence has been adduced in support of the assertion made on behalf of the concerned workman. It will appear from the very evidence of the concerned workman WW-1 that he has read upto Class VII in Bangladesh but he has not produced any School leaving certificate. He also does not remember his age when he had left his studies in the school. He has stated that his age/date of birth was recorded in Form B Register at the time of his appointment on his oral statement and he had not produced any paper in support of his age. He has admitted that he was called for assessment of his age by the age assessment committee. It appears therefore that he is supporting the fact stated by MW-2 that he was called for assessment of his age by the committee and by admitting the fact that he has signed the statement Ext. M-2 shows that the declaration of age was made by the concerned workman. It will thus be clear from the evidence of WW-1 himself that he had never produced any document in support of his age and as such the date of his birth/age as declared by the concerned workman in Ext. M-2 was accepted by the age assessment committee of the management. In view of the fact that the concerned workman himself had declared his age and date of birth as 1-1-1927 before the age assessment committee, the management was quite justified in accepting the said age and super-annuating the concerned workman on the basis of the such age/date of birth declared by the concerned workman.

As against the evidence and discussions made above, I do not find any material on the basis of which it can be declared that the date of birth of the concerned workman was 1-1-1929. The concerned workman has filed 2 petitions Ext. W-2 dated 6-5-86 and Ext. W-3 dated 30-6-86 in which the concerned workman had stated that his age was not correctly recorded in the records of the management. Even in those petitions the concerned workman did not state specifically that his date of birth was 1-1-1929. It is admitted by the concerned workman that he had received the identity card and it is assured by the management that the date of birth of the concerned workman was noted in it. The fact that the concerned workman is not producing the

identity card from his possession shows that his date of birth was recorded in it as 1-1-1927 and therefore he is not producing the identity card. It will appear that the concerned workman had not made any representation in writing prior to May, 1986 protesting regarding his wrong entry of age. The concerned workman had declared his age in Ext. M-2 on 7-6-80 and had the said age been wrongly declared by him the concerned workman must have made a representation to the management soon thereafter stating that the date of birth as declared in Ext. M-2 before the age assessment committee was wrong. In absence of any protest it has to be accepted that the concerned workman had rightly declared his date of birth as 1-1-27.

In view of the facts, evidence and circumstances discussed above I hold that the date of birth of the concerned workman was 1-1-1927 and that he has been rightly superannuated with effect from 1-1-1987 on completing his age of 60 years.

In the result, I hold that the action of the management of Bhowra (North) colliery of M/s. BCCL in retiring the concerned workman Shri. S. B. Chakravorty, Asstt. Foreman from service with effect from 1-1-1987 is justified and consequently the concerned workman is entitled to no relief.

This is my Award.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-24012(2)/87-D.IV(B)/IR(Coal-I)]

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.आ. 3221.—प्रौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार संसद सेन्द्रल कोलफील्ड्स लि. की गिडी-ए वाशरी कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन से संबंधित निरीक्षणों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट प्रौद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रौद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं. 1) घनवाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-11-1989 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1989

S.O. 3221.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. I), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Gidi 'A' Washery, M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-11-1989.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 115 of 1988

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Gidi Washery, Central Coalfields Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra,
Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar
Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 9th November, 1989

AWARD

By Order No. L-24012/37/86-D-IV(B)/D-4(A), dated, the 8th August, 1988, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the Management of Gidi (A) Washery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Gidi 'A', Distt. Hazaribagh, is justified in not employing and departmentalising Sri Indu Ansari and 270 others as per the demand of the Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?"

Name of the workman

1. Idu Ansari
2. Duwarka Thakur
3. Duwarka Bodra
4. Karnil
5. Ramu
6. Robert
7. Mahabir No. I
8. Khabil
9. Budhan
10. Jakamira
11. Raghunath
12. Ramesh
13. Usman
14. Jitu
15. Mahabir No. II
16. Bihan
17. Binod
18. Arjun
19. Ram
20. Parmod
21. Kisto
22. Mathra
23. Ramnath
24. Hardyial
25. Suja
26. Kuldip
27. Parmeshwar
28. Ramji
29. Dhirty
30. Indar Lal
31. Mohit
32. Lafit Ganghy
33. Anthojo
34. Silbastior
35. Smt. Fote
36. Jitwa No. I
37. Ratni No. I
38. Sare
39. Bimla
40. Churmun'a
41. Kablasho
42. Augni
43. Dayamuni
44. Jagmuni
45. Jacanti
46. Fudwa
47. Nagi

48. Rupni
49. Samaji
50. Lolwa
51. Subasho No. I
52. Budhni No. I
53. Sugnia No. I
54. Lakkbatia
55. Parbatia No. I
56. Lilwa
57. Runwa
58. Etwaria
59. Tarwa
60. Savitry
61. Fulranla No. I
62. Sumitra
63. Jirwa No. II
64. Maine
65. Malo
66. Fulkumari
67. Telki
68. Koushilla No. I
69. Malti
70. Karmi
71. Koushilla No. II
72. Dhaneshwari
73. Sanghe
74. Sarsatia I
75. Kari No. I
76. Lagni
77. Kadmi
78. Bali
79. Bsamaia
80. Birsai
81. Dulari
82. Siyan
83. Papon
84. Chamon
85. Parbatia II
86. Gungani
87. Atami
88. Dhanmatia I
89. Piyasho
90. Sugia No. II
91. Fulmanla No. II
92. Hiramani
93. Jalo
94. Jouni
95. Burbatia I
96. Parmila I
97. Bodna
98. Surpatia II
99. Raimuni
100. Pyarmuni
101. Alka
102. Panwa I
103. Surpatia III
104. Munia II
105. Tetri
106. Sukumari
107. Munia I
108. Munia III
109. Loli
110. Buttan
111. Balki
112. Bigo
113. Banahani I
114. Lalit Devi
115. Sundri
116. Jagni
117. Buttan
118. Parmila II
119. Parbatia III
120. Kumari
121. Aron
122. Sanghawa
123. Salimi
124. Shanti I
125. Mantani
126. Durgi
127. Kalabati
128. Surti

129. Roshmi
130. Urshila
131. Shanti III
132. Saroj
133. Nirmala
134. Sitasuni
135. Jattri
136. Balwa
137. Panwa II
138. Gungar
139. Fulato
140. Ghugia
141. Dashmi
142. Charki
143. Subasha II
144. Manti
145. Panwa III
146. Dayanti
147. Mojhron
148. Dular
149. Marry
150. Ratni II
151. Bashmantia I
152. Budhni II
153. Phulo
154. Uma
155. Dhanmatia II
156. Matia
157. Dina
158. Mangani I
159. Phushni
160. Pardon
161. Yamuna
162. Sarojni
163. Mukhli
164. Sowanam
165. Sushil
166. Abi
167. Mangu I
168. Bandhani
169. Bilasho
170. Asho
171. Mangu II
172. Jhalwa
173. Samioharin
174. Barshtia II
175. Budhni III
176. Sarsatin II
177. Bashgi II
178. Khudni
179. Fulmnna III
180. Kat II
181. Shanti Munda
182. Sohgi
183. M. Moulani
184. Jiru
185. Maghlal
186. Noor
187. Sagial
188. Mohaudar Rajhar
189. Ramosar
190. Ashar
191. Ramdial
192. Banshi Ram
193. Binod Singh
194. Matoln
195. Banshi Ram
196. Smt. Saroja Den
197. Smt. Shanti I
198. Rajbahadur
199. Ramparwash
200. Caahdrika
201. Rangit Singh
202. Koulesar
203. Munosar
204. Ramdhani
205. Mahondar Mahto
206. Dashrath Singh

207. Ambica
208. Jiran
209. Shivrabidas
210. Shanka Prasad
219. Laokman
220. Toro
221. Tero
222. Shivakant Jha
223. Shivshankar
224. Sarju
225. Etwaria
226. Surti
227. Rudia
228. Mohondar P. Singh
229. Ramjit Munda
230. Mangora
231. Doman Manji
232. Mani Ram
233. Srinowasan
234. Balkoshwar
235. Proa
236. Hussin Munda
237. Nuyash
238. Rajajuddin
239. Bhumi Fantl
240. Dashrath Manji
241. Asarti Mahto
242. Munshi Pashwan
243. Balosar
244. Jagosar
245. Birsahi
246. Sowak
247. Sant
248. Sant
249. Bharatlal
250. Arun Kumar
251. Sharwan K. Singh
252. Mashroor Alam
253. Natwar
254. Talo Manji
255. Guni Devi
256. Mira
257. Lachminia
258. Shanti II
259. Surpatia
260. Birshi
261. Pulkuman
262. Ialmati
263. Sonamati
264. Talomuni
265. Panpati
266. Noni Bai
267. Gomti Bai
268. Sukurmuni
269. Ramohabila
270. Indarjit Singh
271. Rajoshwar Singh

2. The case of the management of Gidi Washery of Mrs. Central Coalfields Ltd. as disclosed in its written statement-cum-rejoinder, details apart, is as follows.

The instant industrial dispute is not maintainable since there is no relationship of employer and employee between the management and the persons concerned. That apart the instant reference has been made in violation of the provision of Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 and the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vegoils Pvt. Limited Vs. Their Workmen* reported in 1971 (II) L.J. 567. The Central Coalfields Limited does not have any washery with the name of Gidi 'A' Washery. But it has got a Washery by the name of Gidi Washery. This establishment is concerned with beneficiation and processing of coal (Medium Coking Coal) for making its suitable for use in the Steel Plants. In the process of washing of coal, some fine particles of washed coal mixed with the washing fluid/solution flow out of the washery. This can be prevented by modification of the Plant and Machinery of the

Washery which the management could not execute till now due to technical difficulty. However, it is expected that in due course the plant and machinery of the Washery will be modified and Froth Flotation Plant will be installed to prevent slurry from flowing out of the Washery. A part of the slurry flowing out of the Washery is fed back into Washery after collection from the ponds provided for the purpose. For this purpose slurry has to be collected from ponds and taken out. Considering the above peculiar circumstances the management gave the above work of collection of slurry from the ponds to a contractor after complying with the provisions of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. The management has a statutory right for engaging contractors for such type of work until such time the entrusting of such work to the contractors is prohibited by the Central Government under Section 10 of the aforesaid Act. Abolition of the contract system in respect of this type of work has to be dealt with as per the provisions of the above Act and not by way of adjudication of such an issue under the Industrial Disputes Act. The volume of work involved in this case does not require as many as 271 workers. The number required will be much smaller. Further, the employers do not admit that the persons concerned were/are the persons employed by the Contractor and they are members of the sponsoring union. Considering the legal position the Central Government refused to refer the matter in question to an Industrial Tribunal for adjudication. But the sponsoring union filed a writ petition before their Lordships of the Patna High Court, Ranchi Bench and their Lordship directed the Central Government to refer the case for adjudication. It is apparent that the Counsel for the Central Government failed to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble High Court the aforesaid decision of their Lordships of the Supreme Court. The issue relating to prohibition of contract system under Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act was considered by the Contract Labour Central Advisory Board constituted by the Central Government under Section 10 of the said Act. But it could not so far take any decision in respect of prohibition of this type of job to be executed through contractor. There is no justification for abolition of the contract system in the aforesaid job and for departmentalising the same. In the event of the management not being able to modify the plant and machinery to prevent the flow of slurry out of the washery, it has no obligation to take in its employment the workers of the contractor. The Central Coalfields Ltd. has a large number of surplus workers and it can divert such workers to the job in question. In view of these facts and circumstances and legal position, the claim of the concerned persons for departmentalisation is not justified.

3. The case of the concerned workmen, as disclosed in the written statement submitted by the sponsoring union, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, details apart, is as follows.

The concerned workmen have been working as Slurry Cleaning Mazdoor since 1974-75 continuously with unblemished record of services. They have been working within the precinct and premises of Gidi 'A' Washery. All of them have been working regularly and have put in 240 days attendance in each calendar year. They have been working under the direct control and supervision of the management. Although they have been performing the jobs of permanent nature, the management has been disbursing their wages through different intermediaries at different periods and this system of disbursement of wages through intermediaries is nothing but a legal camouflage. They have been receiving the wage of Group-III piece-rated worker as per provision of N.C.W.A.III. They have been receiving also sick leave, bonus, maternity benefit and other benefits as per provisions of N.C.W.A.III. The management of Gidi 'A' Washery have regularised the so called contractor's labourers engaged in unloading job in the Washery after entering into a conciliation settlement with R.C.M.S. on 9-4-82. In terms of the aforesaid conciliation settlement the management has also agreed that the job of slurry cleaning is a permanent nature of job. The management also agreed to consider the cases of slurry cleaning mazdoors for regularisation after discussing the matter with the Director (Personnel) with effect from 7524 GI/89—9.

15-7-82. But as soon as it came to know that the concerned workmen are members of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, it backed out from the assurance given and even to-day the concerned workmen have not been regularised in service as Group-III workers as per N.C.W.A.III. The union represented before the management for regularisation of the concerned workmen with retrospective effect, but the management refused to regularise them and that the same was communicated to the General Secretary of the union by a letter dated 18-8-1982. The local management is very much biased and prejudiced against the concerned workman for their union affiliation; the local management is also biased and prejudiced against the members of the B.C.K.U. The local management with a malafide intention to boost up puppet union has entered into an agreement with that union and thereby regularised the contractors workmen, but as soon as the management has come to know that slurry cleaning mazdoors are the members of B.C.K.U. Union, it back out from their assurance and did not regularise the concerned workmen. Seeing no other alternative the union raised an industrial dispute before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Hazaribagh but the same was ended in failure due to the adamant attitude of the management. The Ministry rejected the reference at the instance of the management. But the sponsoring union challenged the decision of the Ministry before Hon'ble High Court at Patna and as per direction of the Hon'ble High Court the Government was pleased to refer the dispute for adjudication before this Tribunal. The action of the management in not regularising the concerned workmen as its permanent employees is illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the principles of natural justice. The action of the management is also vindictive in nature and smacks of anti-labour policy. In the context of these facts and circumstances, the union has prayed that the concerned workman be regularised in service as slurry cleaning mazdoors in Group-III as per N.C.W.A.III with effect from 1974-75 or atleast from the date when the other contractor's workmen were regularised in service with effect from 1982 with all arrears of wages and consequential benefits.

4. In reply to the written statement of the sponsoring union the management has stated that here exists no washery in the name of Gidi 'A' washery and no worker engaged in slurry removal under the contract system works within the precincts and premises of the Gidi Washery. The persons listed in the reference are being paid as their wages as per piece-rated group-III under N.C.W.A. III by the contractor who is extending some benefits to his workers. Un-loading of coal brought from different collieries to Gidi Washery by non-tipping trucks was under contract system before, but the Central Government abolished the system and considering the man-power position at that time, the management provided employment to some workers of the ex contractor after the abolition of contract system in respect of the job of unloading of coal. It is reiterated that the Government counsel apparently did not bring the aforesaid ruling of their Lordships of the Supreme Court to the notice of the Hon'ble High Court. It has been submitted that the prayer of the union is without merit and liable to be rejected.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management the sponsoring union has firmly asserted that the issue in question involved in the present reference constitutes an industrial dispute and there exists relationship of employer and employees between the management and the concerned workmen. The union has emphatically stated that the reference order has not been made in violation of Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 and the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vegoils Private Ltd. Vs. Their Workmen*. The union has clarified that the demand of the concerned workmen is not for abolition of contract labour system but for their regularisation in service as employees of the management. They have been working in Gidi Washery of M/s. C.C. Ltd. large quantity of parties of washed coal mixed with water flow out of washery and bleeding of slurry would be stopped by modification of plant and machinery of the washery. As a matter of fact, Froth Flotation Plant was installed in 1984 but the same should not prevent flowing of slurry into the pond. It is false to suggest

that modernisation of the plant and machinery could not be done by the management due to some technical difficulties. The plea of stopping the bleeding of slurry upon installation of Froth Flotation Plant was also taken by the management Dugda Coal Washery before Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Board. The Dugda management misguided the Board by submitting that modernisation of plant can stop bleeding of slurry, even though the plant was commissioned after modernisation, the flowing of slurry has not been stopped and a large number of workmen are working at Dugda Coal Washery slurry plant. Large quantity of slurry flowing out of the washery are again fed back into washery after collecting it from the pond erected for the purpose. It is reiterated that the concerned workmen have been working in slurry cleaning work since long continuously which goes to show that the job of slurry cleaning is a permanent nature of job and the action of the management in engaging so-called contract labour in the permanent nature of job is not only illegal and arbitrary but also smacks of anti-labour policy of the management. More than 270 workmen are being engaged by the management for performing the job of slurry cleaning and the management did not take the plea before the Conciliation Officer that the number of requirement of the management would be much smaller. The statement of the management that the Counsel for the Central Government failed to bring the decision of the Supreme Court as reported in *Vegoils Pvt. Ltd. VS. Their Workmen* before the Hon'ble High Court is ludicrous, in the sense that it assumed that the Hon'ble High Court was not aware of the decision of the Supreme Court. The Government of India rejected the dispute without considering the merit of the case because the dispute was not raised by the Government sponsoring union. The present issue does not relate to prohibition of contract system under section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act. The Board did not issue any prohibition order so far as slurry cleaning job is concerned. It is denied that M/s. C.C. Ltd. has a large number of surplus workers and that those workers will be diverted to the slurry cleaning in the event of the said job being declared as a prohibited category of job. The union has reiterated that the action of the management in not regularising the concerned workmen as departmental workers is illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the principles of natural justice.

6. The sponsoring union submitted its rejoinder on 20-2-1989. It appears that the management, after submission of the rejoinder of the union, contrived to make out a plea of inadvantage and made the unique discovery that it has got a Froth Flotation Plant which was installed in 1985 and thereafter proceeded to ramify and revamp its case obviously to deny and defeat the claim of the sponsoring union by stating as follows :

"In the process of washing of coal some fine particles of washed coal get mixed up with the washing fluid solution and flow out of washery as a part of slurry. For preventing flow of such particles of coal, as a part of slurry, an additional Plant and Machinery in the form of Froth Flotation Plant has to be installed. While Gidi Washery started functioning in or about 1974, the Froth Flotation Plant could be installed only in the year 1985 which is capable of not only recycling the Slurry for recovery of clean coal/fine particles of coal for the purpose of use in the Steel Plants, but also for recovering such clean coal/fine particles from the Slurry which had been collected over the years and accumulated in huge stock running into several lakhs of tonnes. Due to technical difficulties and also deterioration of the quality of Slurry, which had accumulated over the years, the latter part of the machinery could not be put into commission. The present position is that the recycling of slurry through Froth Flotation Plant is a regular part of operation of Gidi Washery and only coal rejects/waste material (tailings) are flowing out into the Ponds through Froth Flotation Plant and are being collected and stacked by the

workers of a contractor. This process is no longer necessary and can be avoided by diverting the discharge of such coal rejects/tailings into a suitable site and this matter is receiving the attention of the management. Considering the above peculiar circumstances, the management awarded the work of collection of rejects/tailings from Slurry pond and stacking them in the near by area through a contractor after complying with the provisions of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and this is a temporary phase and it is not a permanent work and no long term arrangement for such job is necessary through manual labour."

This statement of facts was made on 26-7-89 by way of a petition for substitution/replacement of earlier statement in its written statement in paras 5, 6 and 7 by the statement of facts as stated before.

The hearing of the case commenced on 26-7-89 and on the same date the management submitted the aforesaid statement of facts before the Tribunal.

7. The management in order to justify its action, has examined five witnesses, namely MW-1 D. K. Saha, now holding the post of Superintending Engineer (E&M) in Gidi Washery, MW-2 S. K. Mukhopadhyay, now posted as Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad, MW-3 Radha Mohan Sinha now working as Dy. Personnel Manager in Gidi Washery, MW-4 Ajit Kumar Basak, presently working in M/s. C.C. Ltd. and looking after the quality aspect of both input and output of coal washery and MW-5 Uddho Patil, now posted as Manager, Quality Control, Giddi Washery and laid in evidence a mass of documents which have been marked Exts. M-1 to M-10. On the other hand, the sponsoring union has examined two witnesses, namely, WW-1 Dwirika Thakur, one of the concerned workmen and WW-2, presently working as Fitter Operator in Froth Flotation Plant of the Washery and Branch Secretary of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union and laid in evidence a sheaf of documents which have been marked Exts. W-1 to W-17.

8. The management had contended that this reference order has made in violation of the provisions of Sec. 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vegoils Pvt. Ltd. VS. The Workmen* reported in 1971(II)(LLJ. 567).

Shri R. S. Murthy, learned Advocate for the management has submitted that the demand of the sponsoring union is for abolition of contract labour with regard to the job of removal of slurry/tailings as obtaining in Gidi Washery which can be done only by the appropriate Government under the provisions of Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970. He has further stated that since the demand of the union is for abolition of contract labour system in this job, the present reference is not maintainable.

The pleading of the sponsoring union has made it abundantly clear that the demand of the union is not for abolition of contract system in this particular type of job and that the demand of the union is for regularisation of the workmen listed in the reference as departmental workmen. Sri D. Mukherjee has also made this submission to counter the contention of Sri Murthy.

9. The pleading of the sponsoring union nowhere claims abolition of contract labour system in removal of slurry/tailings as obtaining in Gidi Washery. It has simply demanded regularisation of the concerned workmen as regular workmen of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. In the case reported in *Vegoils Pvt. Ltd. VS. The Workmen* 1971(II)(LLJ. 567) the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the demand for abolition of contract system does not fall within the purview of the Industrial Disputes Act. In the present case also the sponsoring union has not claimed for abolition of contract labour system and so the contention of Sri Murthy that the

present reference is not maintainable within the frame-work of Industrial Disputes Act must founder on the ground. Accordingly, I hold that the present dispute is maintainable.

10. Before I pass on to the other issues, I consider it worthwhile to discuss one of the contentions of the management which flows from the present reference having been made by the appropriate Government. Admittedly, the appropriate Government initially refused to refer the present dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal. Later, in terms of the order of Hon'ble Patna High Court the appropriate Government was constrained to make this reference of industrial dispute. The management has stated that Hon'ble Patna High Court gave direction to the appropriate Government to refer the case for adjudication since the Council for the Central Government failed to bring the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vegoils Pvt. Ltd. VS. The Workmen* to the notice of the Hon'ble Court. This contention has also been reiterated by the management in its rejoinder.

It is presumed that the Hon'ble Patna High Court was satisfied about the merit of the case of the union and having coming to the conclusion that there exists no infirmity in the case, it was pleased to direct the appropriate Government to make reference of industrial dispute for adjudication by the Industrial Tribunal. It is really unfortunate on the part of the management to suggest obliques that the Council for the Central Government failed to bring the aforesaid decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the notice of the Hon'ble High Court, Patna, as if that the Hon'ble High Court was not aware of this decision or even if it was so aware it was not mindful of it or ignored it unwittingly. This contention of the management is considered to be of reflection on the wisdom of the Judges of the Patna High Court. I consider that the contention of the management as stated above is not only unfortunate but also deplorable as it tantamounts to be a reflection on the wisdom and sagacity of the Judges of the Hon'ble Patna High Court.

11. The concerned workmen have claimed in the written statement that they have been working within the precinct and premises of Gidi 'A' Washery. The management has taken exception to it and has stated that the Central Coalfields Ltd. has got no Washery by the name of Gidi 'A' Washery and that it has got a Washery by the name of Gidi Washery. The union has corrected this position in its rejoinder. Since the Central Coalfields Ltd. has got a Washery by the name of Gidi Washery I think that the management has not been misled in the matter in any way and the pleading of the management eloquently testifies this position.

12. The schedule of the present reference bears out serial numbers of workmen as 271, but it should be 261 because there is a gap of 8 serial numbers between 210 and 219 and the names of 2 workmen have been repeated twice. Thus, the present dispute is confined to 261 workmen.

At the time of hearing the management has fished out the names of 13 workmen and asserted that 12 of them are dead and one workman, Rajbahadur Singh by name (Sl. No. 198) is employed in M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. in place of his father (Ext. M-5). This document has been prepared by MW-3 Radha Mohan Sinha, Dy. Personnel Manager of Gidi Washery. He has stated that he has prepared this list in consultation with the record of the contractor. But the record of the contractor has not been produced nor has the contractor been examined nor has any death certificate in support of the death of aforesaid 12 workmen been produced by the management. The plea of the management does not disclose the fact of death of these workmen. However, WW-1 Dwrika Thakur has candidly admitted in his examination-in-chief that out of the listed workmen Ranparwash (Sl. No. 199) is dead and Rajbahadur (Sl. No. 198) has since got employment in M/s. C.C. Ltd. Thus, it is seen that 259 workmen are left in the field. The contention of the management in respect of other 11 workmen who are claimed by it to have died, cannot be accepted in view of the above facts and lacunae in the evidence of the management.

13. The pleading of the management underlines the fact that Giddi Washery started functioning in or about 1974. MW-1 D. K. Saha, Superintending Engineer (E&M) of the Washery has also stated that the Washery started in or about 1974 and that between the period 1974-75 till the installation of Froth Flotation Plant the slurry was flowing out of the washery and used to be collected by man-power and stacked near the pond adjacent to the Washery. He had admitted in cross-examination that the washing plant is situated in the precinct and premises of Giddi 'A' Colliery and that Gidi 'A' colliery is a non-coking colliery. According to him, originally the Washery was constructed for supplying non-coking coal to the Railways. But as the Rly. refused to take non-coking washed coal it was converted to a Washery of medium coking coal and the function of the washery is to reduce the impurity of coking coal and also to reduce the ash contents. He has also stated that the Washery, Froth Flotation Plant, Slurry Ponds and Stores are situated within one boundary having the same outlet and that there exist three slurry ponds which were constructed by the management. Slurry, according to this witness, is the mixture of stone dust, coal dust and sand etc. and before commission of Froth Flotation Plant slurry was bled out of the washery and deposited in the slurry ponds. Thus, the position is reached that Giddi Washery came into existence in or about 1974 and that function of the washery is to reduce impurity of the coking coal and also reduce ash contents and that slurry flowing out of the washery and deposited in slurry ponds was used to be collected by the man-power and stacked near the pond adjacent to the washery. He has further disclosed in his evidence that the concerned workmen have been regularly working in the slurry ponds.

The case of the sponsoring union is also that the concerned workmen have been working as slurry cleaning mazdoors in Giddi Washery since 1974-75. MW-1 has admitted that all the workmen working in the slurry ponds have been issued identity cards. The sponsoring union has submitted the identity cards in respect of all the 261 workmen including the one who has left the employment and one who is dead as mentioned earlier (Ext. W-1 series). WW-1 Dwrika Thakur has stated that he has been working in Gidi Washery continuously since 1974 and that all other concerned workmen of this reference case have been working continuously in Gidi Washery since 1974. MW-3 Radha Mohan Sinha, Dy. Personnel Manager of Gidi Washery could not dispute that the concerned workmen have not been working in Gidi Washery; he has simply stated that out of 261 concerned workmen 13 are no longer there, 11 of them having died earlier, one employed in M/s. C.C. Ltd. in place of his father and one died on 3-2-81. I have considered his evidence in respect of deaths of 12 workmen and have already come to the conclusion that only one of them is dead and another workman has left his employment to join M/s. C.C. Ltd. Thus, from the evidence on record it is firmly established that the concerned workmen excepting the one who is dead and the other one who has left his employment as mentioned earlier the remaining 259 concerned workmen have been working in the slurry pond of Gidi Washery since 1974.

14. The evidence of MW-1 Dwrika Thakur discloses that all the concerned workmen have put in 270-280 days of attendance in every calendar year. He has further stated that even after installation of Froth Flotation Plant the concerned workmen including himself have been putting in attendance for at least 260 days in a calendar year. The management could not produce any evidence to disprove this evidence. That being so, I am constrained to conclude that the concerned 259 workmen have been working in Gidi Washery since 1974 and that they have been rendering continuous service in the Washery.

15. Admittedly, Froth Flotation Plant was installed in the Washery in 1985. This fact, as I have stated earlier, was totally ignored by the management in its written statement initially and later by way of a statement of facts installation of Froth Flotation Plant was admitted. The function of Flotation Plant as disclosed in the statement of facts by the management is that it is capable of not only recycling of

slurry for recovery of clean coal/fine particles of coal for the purpose of use in the Steel Plant but also for recovery of such clean/fine particles from the slurry which had been collected over the years and accumulated in huge stock running into several lots of tonnes and due to technical difficulty and deterioration of the quality of slurry accumulated over the years, the latter part of the machinery could not be put into commission. It has also been disclosed by the management in its petition that the coal rejects/tailings are flowing out into the ponds through Froth Flotation Plant and are being collected and stacked by the workmen of a contractor.

Admittedly, the concerned workmen have been engaged in the slurry ponds of the management by a contractor. The contention of the management is that the rejects and waste materials (tailings) have been flowing into the pond through Froth Flotation Plant and are being collected and stacked by the workers of a contractor. But the agreement with the management entered into with the present contractor, Saryu Gope dated 20-4-81 (Ext. M-1) indicates that the contract was awarded for cleaning of slurry and tailings from the tailings ponds and stacking it around the pond of Gidi Washery. The earlier agreement dated 5-10-87 was with one M/s. Sengupta & Co. another contractor also indicates that the contractor was engaged for manual extraction of slurry/tailings from the tailing pond and stacking the same on the East side of the Pond. Thus, the agreement produced by the management establish the facts that the contractor was engaged for manual extraction of slurry/tailings from slurry/tailings ponds of the Washery. Although, MW-1D. K. Saha has endeavoured to state that now at present the entire slurry bleeding out of the washery is directed to the Froth Flotation Plant, he has had to admit that only small portion of slurry is left out but overwhelming portion is directed to the Froth Flotation Plant. He has further admitted that slurry bled out of the washery comes through two thickeners. He has further stated that through one thickener slurry is diverted to the Froth Flotation Plant. The management has attempted to establish a case that the other thickener remains idle. It has been disclosed by WW-1 in his evidence that each thickener is provided with one pump and slurry goes direct from the washery to the two thickeners and that slurry from one of the two thickeners directly goes into the slurry ponds and one-fourth of other slurry goes to the Froth Flotation Plant and the three-fourth of the rest goes to the slurry pond. This evidence of his has not been displaced in cross-examination. MW-2 S. K. Mukhopadhyay is the Regional Labour Commissioner (C) posted at Dhanbad. He has stated that when he had occasion to visit Gidi Washery sometime in 1987-88 he saw that in spite of installation of Froth Flotation Plant slurry from the washery was being collected in the slurry ponds of the washery. Thus, from the evidence on record it is firmly established that not only tailings or rejects have been flowing into slurry/tailings ponds of the washery, but also slurry has been flowing into these ponds.

16. In order to demolish the case of the sponsoring union the management at the time of hearing introduced a story that the tailings flowing out of the Froth Flotation Plant are of no use. Of course usefulness or otherwise of tailings/rejects have not been pleaded by the management in its pleadings. Anyway, MW-4 Aji Kumar Basak has been examined mainly to prove that the tailings/rejects are of no use. MW-5 Uddho Patil, now posted as Manager, Quality Control, has been examined to prove that the tailings are of no use. Photostat copy of letter indicating sending of slurry sample dated 4-12-86 (Ext. M-6) and analysis report (Ext. M-7) have been laid in evidence by the management. MW-5 has stated that the management follows the standard prescribed by I.S.I with regard to taking of sample. But there is no vestige of evidence to indicate what is the standard prescribed by I.S.I. with regard to taking of samples. There is no evidence at all to show that samples were taken in accordance with prescribed standard.

In view of the fact that there is no pleading of the management that tailings/rejects are of no use and the evidence discussed above I come to the conclusion that the case of the management that tailings/rejects are of no use has been

introduced to revamp its case. That apart, it has not been proved by satisfactory evidence of samples were taken in prescribed manner and that the tailings/rejects are of no use.

17. The case of the sponsoring union is that slurry cleaning is a permanent nature of job. This has been disputed by the management. But in 1982 the management arrived at an agreement with the union led by R.C.M.S. This agreement indicates that cleaning of slurry pond is a permanent nature of job (Ext. W-17). The evidence discloses that the concerned workmen have been regularly working in the slurry/tailings ponds continuously even after the installation of Froth Flotation Plant in 1985. This is indicative of the fact that the job of slurry/tailings cleaning is a permanent nature of job. Even highly placed responsible officer as Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad (MW-2) has stated that it is a matter for the Government to decide whether the job of slurry cleaning is permanent nature of job or not, but, nevertheless, the job has come to stay. This indirectly means that the job has got permanency in character. WW-1 Dwirika Thakur has also stated that the job of the concerned workmen in the washery is of permanent nature. The management has stated in its petition that the process of collection and stacking of rejects is no longer necessary and can be diverted by discharging of these things into a suitable site, and that the matter is receiving the attention of the management. But not a whit of evidence has been laid to show that the management has been contemplating to discharge rejects/tailings to a suitable site. This being so, I come to the conclusion that the job of slurry/tailings/rejects cleaning is of a permanent nature of job.

18. Admittedly, the management has got this job done by the concerned workmen through a contractor. Admittedly, wage bills (Ext. W-10), profit-sharing bonus (Ext. W-4), sick leave (Ext. W-3) and bonus-sheet (Ext. W-5) have been prepared by the contractor. It also appears from the agreement that the contractor is liable to pay these benefits to the workmen. But nevertheless, it appears that the management has issued direction to the contractor not to employ substitute workers (Ext. W-6). Then again the management has written to the contractor directing him to submit details of the persons concerned who were involved in the Vakil Singh's murder case (Ext. W-8). The management directed the contractor to stop attendance of all workmen of slurry ponds who allegedly acted illegally by entering into the Gidi Washery Dispensary and man-handled the Compounder (Ext. W-9). The management has written to the contractor directing him to take necessary action against the workmen who demonstrated in the office of the Project (Ext. W-12). All these documents are suggestive of the fact that the contractor is only name lender and the management is ultimately taking all actions from behind.

WW-1 Dwirika Prasad has stated that they have been working for 8 hours a day and the management has been supervising their job and providing them work implements to perform their job. He has further stated that they have been getting wages as admissible to Group III employees as per N.C.W.A.III and that they are getting same benefits, such as, attendance bonus, annual bonus etc. at par with the permanent employees of the management. But they are not getting house allowance, L.T.C., Conveyance allowance etc. He has emphatically stated that they have not seen the intermediary in person and so the question of his supervision and control over their job does not arise. The management has laid no evidence to prove specifically as to who supervise and control the job of the concerned workmen. If the principal employer i.e. management does away with engagement of contractor, the concerned workmen will presumably lose their source of earning. The concerned workmen render services for the business of the management and so the management is the real employer of the concerned workmen. The management has got control over the workers subsistence, skill and continued employment. In the circumstances, the management is held to be the real employer of the concerned workmen and the presence of an intermediary is nothing but a camouflaged or subterfuge adopted by the management. Thus, it is held that there exists relationship of employer and employee between

the management of Gidi Washery and the concerned workmen.

19. The case of the sponsoring union is that the management of Gidi Washery is refusing to regularise and departmentalise the concerned workmen. Since the concerned workmen are really the workmen of the management the refusal of the management to regularise and departmentalise them is unfair and unjust. The management is hereby directed to regularise the 259 concerned workmen in service as workmen of Group III as per NCWA-III with effect from the date of this reference i.e. 8-8-1988 and to pay them back wages and other benefits minus the wages and other benefits already paid to them.

20. Accordingly, the following award is rendered the action of the management of Gidi Washery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. in not regularising and departmentalising the 259 concerned workmen is unjustified. The management is directed to regularise and departmentalise to them as workers of Group-III as per provisions of N.C.W.A.III and to pay them back wages and other benefits minus the wages and other benefits already paid to them.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-240123(7)/86.D4(B)/D.IV(A)/IR(Cool-J)]

का.प्र. 3222:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1917 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भेसम भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. की भोवरा क्षेत्र सं. 11 की बमरो कोलियरी के प्रबन्धक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अवयव में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 2), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-11-1989 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3222.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bararee Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-11-1989.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri I. N. Sinha, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. 250 OF 1987

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bararee Colliery of Bhowda Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O.

3524 GI/89—10

Bhulanbararee, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri J. D. Lall, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. N. Prasad, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated Dhanbad, the 16th November, 1989

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(226)/86-D.IV(B), dated, the 29th August, 1987.

THE SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Management of Bararee Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bhulanbararee Distt. Dhanbad in not allowing Shri Ganga Prasad, Miner/Loader to resume his duty after expiry of the period of suspension for ten days is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Shri Ganga Pd. was employed as Miner/Loader in Bararee Colliery of M/s. BCCL. He was a permanent workman of the colliery. On 3-3-86 the management of Bararee Colliery issued chargesheet against the concerned workman for misconduct and suspended, him with immediate effect, i.e. from 3-3-86. The concerned workman submitted his reply dated 14-3-87 to the chargesheet denying the allegation levelled against him in the charge. The management did not hold any enquiry into the charge for a long time and the concerned workman continued to be under suspension. The service conditions of the concerned workman are governed by the provisions of the Standing Orders applicable to the Bararee Colliery. In clause 27 of the Certified Standing Orders of the colliery a workman cannot be placed under suspension pending enquiry for more than 10 days. Clause 27 of the S.O. provides that an employee may be suspended, fined or dismissed without notice or any compensation in lieu of notice if he is found to be guilty of misconduct provided that suspension without pay whether as a punishment or pending enquiry shall not exceed 10 days. After expiry of 10 days of his suspension, the concerned workman sent a representation dated 2-4-86 addressed to the Supdt. of Bararee Colliery with a copy to the General Manager, Bhowra Area requesting the management to allow him to resume his duties pending enquiry on the ground that the management cannot suspend him for more than 10 days pending enquiry. The management did not give any reply to his representation nor he was allowed to resume his duties. The union of the workman also made a re-

presentation dated 24-6-86 for allowing the concerned workman to resume his duties pending enquiry. Again the management did not give any reply nor the concerned workman was allowed to resume his duties. After remaining under suspension without wages for the period from 3-3-86 to 8-6-87 the concerned workman was dismissed from service with effect from 8-6-87. The concerned workman was put under suspension without wages for a period of more than a year and the same was in violation of the certified standing orders applicable to the colliery. The concerned workman is entitled to full wages for the period of his suspension exceeding 10 days till his dismissal i.e. from 13-3-86 to 8-6-87 and he is also entitled to 50 per cent wages for the period of 10 days of his suspension from 3-3-86 to 12-3-86. The concerned workman has raised a separate industrial dispute through his union in respect of his dismissal from service which is still pending. On the above facts it is prayed that the action of the management in not allowing the concerned workman to resume his duties after the expiry of 10 days of his suspension is illegal, violative of the provisions of Certified standing orders of the colliery and that the management should be directed to pay full wages to the concerned workman for the period of his suspension exceeding 10 days i.e. from 13-3-86 to 8-6-87 and for payment of 50 per cent wages for 10 days of suspension from 3-3-86 to 12-3-86.

The case of the management is that the concerned workman was working as a Miner/loader at Bararee colliery and was given employment against the land acquisition. It was subsequently revealed that the concerned workman had obtained the employment in a fraudulent manner and he had no connection with the land acquired against which employment was given to the concerned workman. The said act committed by the concerned workman constituted misconduct under the relevant provisions of the Certified standing orders and was chargesheeted and placed under suspension vide chargesheet dated 3-3-86. Clause 28 of the Certified standing orders provides that during the period of enquiry on the allegation of misconduct the employee concerned shall be suspended. The suspension of the concerned workman during the departmental enquiry was in terms of the standing orders. Clause 29 of the Certified Standing Orders deals with the manner in which the period of suspension is to be treated after the conclusion of the proceeding. According to clause 29 if on enquiry the order is confirmed or modified the employee shall be deemed to be absent from duty for the period of suspension and shall not be entitled to any remuneration for such period. If, however, the order is rescinded, the employee shall be deemed to be on duty during the full period of suspension and shall be entitled to the same wages as he would have received if he had not been suspended. There was no question of allowing the concerned workman to resume duty after expiry of 10 days of his suspension during the pendency of the enquiry and paying him full or any wages during the suspension period and before the conclusion of the departmental proceeding. The action of the management in not allowing the con-

cerned workman on duty after the expiry of the ten days of suspension is perfectly justified and lawful and he was not entitled to any relief. On the above plea it is prayed on behalf of the management that the award be made in favour of the management.

The only point to be decided in this case is whether the concerned workman is entitled to be allowed to resume his duties after expiry of the period of his suspension for 10 days.

Neither of the parties examined any witness. Both the parties relied on the interpretation of the certified standing orders Ext. M-1. No other document except Ext.M-1 has been exhibited.

It is the admitted case of the parties that the concerned workman was suspended with effect from 3-3-86 during the pendency of an enquiry alleging misconduct against him. It is also admitted that the concerned workman was dismissed from service after holding enquiry with effect from 8-6-87. The prayer of the workmen is that the concerned workman should have been allowed to resume his duties after expiry of 10 days of his suspension period and that the management should pay 1/2 pay for the period from 3-3-86 to 12-3-86 and that he should be paid full wages after the period of 10 days suspension i.e. to say that he should get full pay from 13-3-86 to 8-6-87.

The workmen have put their reliance on the interpretation of clause 27 of the Certified Standing orders Ex.M-1. Let us therefore look to the provisions of clause 27 of Ext.M-1. Clause 27 provides as follows :—

“An employee may be suspended, fined or dismissed without notice or any compensation in lieu of notice if he is found to be guilty of misconduct, provided that suspension without pay, where as a punishment or pending an enquiry, shall not exceed 10 days.”

It will appear from clause 27 that an employee found to be guilty of misconduct can be suspended as a measure of punishment but the limitation in that case as punishment will be that he cannot be suspended without pay for a period of more than 10 days as punishment on his being found guilty of misconduct. It will thus appear at the first instance that the suspension as a punishment for misconduct cannot be given for more than 10 days without pay. The other part of this clause shows that suspension of an employee pending an enquiry shall not exceed 10 days without pay which will mean that for a period of 10 days an employee may be suspended for 10 days without pay. Thus this clause 27 will not help the concerned workman to claim that he should be allowed to resume his duties after expiry of the period of suspension for 10 days.

Clause 28 of the Standing Order Ext.M-1, on the other hand, will show that during the period enquiries are being made on account of alleged misconduct, the employee concerned shall be suspended. Thus this clause shows that an employee against

whom enquiries are being made for misconduct may be suspended during the period of the enquiry. Clause 29 of Ext.M-1 provides that if on enquiry the order is confirmed or modified the employee shall be deemed to be absent from duty for the period of suspension and shall not be entitled to any remuneration for such period. If, however, the order is rescinded the employee shall be deemed to be on duty during the full period of suspension and shall be entitled to the same wages as he would have received if he had not been suspended. On the basis of this clause the management submits that on enquiry the concerned workman has been found guilty and as absent from duty for the period of suspension and shall not be entitled to any remuneration for such a period.

Section 10A of the Industrial Employment (SO) Act, 1946 was introduced by an Act No. 18 of 1982 with effect from 17-5-82. Section 10A provides for payment of subsistence allowance. It provides :—

“Where any workman is suspended by the employer pending investigation or enquiry into complaints or charges of misconduct against him, the employer shall pay to such workman subsistence allowance :

- (a) @50 per cent of the wages which the workman was entitled to immediately preceding the date of such suspension for the first 90 days of the suspension, and
- (b) @75 per cent of such wages for the remaining period of suspension if the delay in the completion of the disciplinary proceeding against such workman is not directly attributable to the conduct of such workman.

Clause III of Section 10A provides that notwithstanding anything contained in Section 10A, where provision relating to payment of subsistence allowance under any law for the time being enforced in state are more beneficial than the provision of the section, the provision of such other law shall be applicable to the payment of subsistence allowance in that state.”

The provision of Section 10A of the Industrial Employment (SO) Act were introduced in 1982 which was much later than the provisions of the Standing orders Ext.M-1 and as such the provisions of Section 10A has to be applied in the case of the concerned workman and the provisions contained in clause 29 of Ext.M-1 will not be applicable as the same is not favourable to the workmen. Accordingly I hold that the concerned workman is not entitled to resume his duties after the expiry of the period of suspension for 10 days as there is no provision that a workman against whom an enquiry is being made on the charge of misconduct must be allowed to resume his duties after the expiry of the period of suspension of 10

3524 GI/89—11

days. However, the concerned workman in accordance with Section 10A of the Industrial Employment (SO) Act is entitled to subsistence allowance @50 per cent of wages which he was entitled immediately preceding the date of his suspension for the first 90 days of his suspension and that he is also entitled to 75 per cent of such wages for the remaining period of suspension. In the present case there is no allegation by the management that there was any delay in the completion of the disciplinary proceeding against the concerned workman at the instance of the concerned workman. Thus the concerned workman will be entitled to 50 per cent of his wages as subsistence allowance from 3-3-86 to 3-6-86 and he should get 75 per cent of his wages as subsistence allowance from 13-6-86 to 8-6-87.

An award is passed accordingly.

Sd/-

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-24012(226)/86.D IV(B)/IR(Coal-I)]

नई दिल्ली, 7 दिसम्बर, 1989

का.आ. 3223.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, संसद भारत कोकिंग कोय लि. का कूरीदिह कोलियरी से सम्बन्धित नियोजन और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुदान में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक प्रतिक्रिया (में 2) प्रस्ताव के पंचांग को प्रकाशित करती है।

New Delhi, the 7th December, 1989

S.O. 3223.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kooridih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and their workmen.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

PRESENT

Shri I. N. Sinha,

Presiding Officer.

Reference No 229 of 1986.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kooridih Colliery of Messrs. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

On behalf of the employers : Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 16th November, 1989

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012 (86)/86-D.III(A), dated the 4th July, 1986.

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of Koyla Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat that the management of Kooridih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited should regularise their workman, Shri Upendra Narayan Singh, as Personnel Assistant is justified? If so to what relief is workman entitled?"

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Shri U. N. Singh was working as a Personnel Assistant since July, 1984 in Kooridih colliery of M/s. BCCL. One Shri D. D. Singh was working as Personnel Assistant at Kooridih colliery who was transferred to Akashkinani colliery. After the transfer of Shri D.D. Singh, Personnel Assistant a permanent vacancy arose in Kooridih colliery. In order to fill up the said vacancy the management directed the concerned workman to take charge from Shri D.D. Singh. The concerned workman took charge after the transfer of Shri D. D. Singh and he started working as Personnel Assistant against the permanent vacancy. The concerned workman was put in continuous service since then. He represented before the management for his regularisation as Personnel Assistant and for payment of proper wages as per NCWA-III but without any effect. Thereafter the union raised an industrial dispute and on failure of conciliation the present reference has been made to this Tribunal for adjudication. It is submitted that the action of the management in not regularising the concerned workman as Personnel Assistant and not paying him the wages as per Wage Board recommendation and NCWAs was illegal and against the principles of natural justice. On the above facts it is prayed that the concerned workman should be regularised as permanent Personnel Assistant.

The case of the management is that the workman is seeking promotion in the garb of a demand for his regularisation as Personnel Assistant. The concerned workman was appointed as Munshi on 24-8-73 and is working as Welfare Officer's clerk in Clerical Grade-II since 1-10-75. He was never promoted as P.A. and he is not performing the duty of P.A. M/s. BCCL has formulated a cadre scheme for clerical staff in consultation with the union of the workmen which has been revised from time to time for the promotion of Clerical staff. The concerned workman has not yet been promoted on the basis of selection on merit on the posts prescribed under the cadre scheme. There

are several clerks in the colliery who are senior to the concerned workman and if a junior like the concerned workman is promoted ignoring the claim of his senior clerks there will be great resentment between the workmen. Welfare Officer's clerk is in clerical grade-II and the post of Personnel Assistant is in Clerical Grade-I. On the above facts it is submitted that the concerned workman is not entitled for being regularised as Personnel Assistant in Clerical Grade-I.

FINDINGS

It was for the union of the workman to establish the demand that the management of Kooridih colliery should regularise the concerned workman as Personnel Assistant as per the schedule of the order of reference. Although the workmen were represented by Shri D. Mukherjee in this case he left taking any step in the case on behalf of the workmen on the ground that he has no instruction and that no witness has turned up whom he could examine in the case. The learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the management did not examine any witness submitting that it was for the workmen to establish their demand and as they have not adduced any evidence in the case, the management would not adduce any evidence and that the Award be made against the workmen. It will appear from the schedule to the order of reference that the demand has to be established by the union and in view of the fact that the union did not examine any witness to establish their demand, I hold that the union of workmen have failed to establish their demand. Accordingly I hold that the concerned workman is not entitled to be regularised as Personnel Assistant.

In the result, I hold that the demand of Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat that the management of Kooridih Colliery of M/s. BCCL should regularise their workman Shri Upendra Naryan Singh as Personnel Assistant is not justified and accordingly the concerned workman is entitled to no relief.

This is my Award.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(86)/86-D.III(A)]IR (Coal-I)

का.पा. 3224—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मैसर्स भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. की भटखेड कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, प्रमुख में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं. 1) धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है।

S.O. 3224.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhatke Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and their workmen.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL N. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 114 of 1988.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhatdee Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri K. M. Singh, General Manager, Monuda Area of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

For the Workmen : Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 19th October, 1989.

AWARD

The present reference arises out of Order No. L-20012/108/88-3(A), dated 4-8-1988 passed by the Central Government in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and the said schedule runs as follows:—

“Whether the demotion of Abdul Rajak from the post of driver to Miner/Loader by the Management of Bhatdee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The dispute has been settled out of Court. A memorandum of settlement has been filed in Court. I have gone through the terms of settlement and I find them quite fair and reasonable. There is no reason why an award should not be made on the basis of terms and conditions laid down in the memorandum of settlement. I accept it and make an award accordingly. The memorandum of settlement shall form part of the award.

3. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Ministry as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(108)/88-D.II(A)/IR (Coal-I)]

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1 DHANBAD.

Ref. No. 114/88.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhurungiya Project of M/s. BCCL.

AND

Their workmen

JOINT COMPROMISE PETITION

The party named above most respectfully beg to submit as under :—

- (1) That the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour vide their order No. 20012/108/88-3(A) dated 4-8-1988 have referred the above matter to the Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication with the following schedule:—

“Whether the demotion of Abdul Rajak from the post of driver to Miner/Loader by the Management of Bhatdee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. is justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled?”

- (2) That while the matter still pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal, the parties have discussed and negotiated this matter with a view to find out a mutually agreed solution.

- (3) That as a result of this negotiation the parties have agreed to settle this matter on the following terms and conditions :

- (1) The workman Sri Abdul Rajak Loader will be put back on the job of a driver with immediate effect on trial/experimental basis for a period of six months.

- (2) His performance during the six months of trial/experimental period will be carefully watched and the same is found to be satisfactory he will be absorbed as a regular driver.

- (3) In case, however, his performance is not found satisfactory during the trial/experimental period of six months, he will be put back on his original job as Minor/Loader.

- (4) That the parties consider and confirm this settlement as just fair and reasonable to both the parties.

PRAYER :

The parties, therefore, most respectfully pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be gracious enough to accept this joint compromise and give the Award in terms thereof.

Representing the workman,

Sd/-

Illegible

1. Secretary of the Union
19-10-89

2. Sri Abdul Rajak
(Workman)

Dated ————-1989.

Witnesses:—

Sd/-

Illegible

Sd/-

Illegible

Representing the employers

GENERAL MANAGER

MEHUDA AREA

M/S Bharat Coking Coal Ltd

का. अ. 3225.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वये में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भूमि सेल्युल कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड की ओर से प्रोडरजार्ज प्रोजेक्ट के प्रबन्धन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अन्वये में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 2) धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 27-11-89 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3225.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kedla Underground Project of M/s. C. C. Ltd. and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 27-11-1989.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri I. N. Sinha, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 60 of 1985

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kedla Under ground Project of Central Coalfields Limited, Delhi. Hazaribagh and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murtby, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 20th November, 1989

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of

the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(104)/84-DIV(B) dated, the 18th May, 1985.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Kedla Underground Project of Central Coalfields Limited District Hazaribagh in denying regularisation and not giving proper categories to Shri Dhirtu Oraon and 76 other employees as per annexure for years together is legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

ANNEXURE

1. Dhirtu Oraon
2. Chandeswar Ram.
3. Ghura Rajwar.
4. Narmuddin Mia.
5. Ram Das Bhuian.
6. Suresh Singh Yadav.
7. Vigan Yadav.
8. Raj Kumar Kalia.
9. Ghannoo Ram.
10. Bhuneswar Mahto.
11. Piary Rajwar.
12. Ram Singh Yadav.
13. Ajij Mian.
14. Jageswar Lohar.
15. Jubraj Mistry.
16. Denamanjhi.
17. Mangra Manjhi.
18. Dena Manjhi II
19. Brijnath Mahto.
20. Ramlal Manjhi.
21. Bhuneswar Mahto.
22. Shiv Pd.
23. Dag Lal Ram.
24. Bhole Rajwar.
25. Shimrat Prashi.
26. Gana Ram.
27. Chand Mukh Oraon.
28. Shapna Oraon.
29. Shadav Dhobi.
30. Bishun Rajwar.
31. Somra Oraon.
32. Ballo Das.
33. Gangadhar Ram.
34. Jeevlal Singh.
35. Birsha Rajwar II.
36. Keshwar II.
37. Jagdish Mistry.
38. Dongra Rajwar.
39. Saryu Manjhi.
40. Jagdish Jarwar.
41. Ramchalak Nonia.
42. Surendra Ram.
43. Rajiuddin Ansari.
44. Amman Mia.
45. Hanumanta Kurmi.
46. Rohit Ram.
47. Tilakdhari Kurmi.
48. Munnu Ram.
49. Rooplal Saatra.
50. Salikh Ram.
51. Mangar Mahto.
52. Jagarnath Rajwar.
53. Tilak Ram.
54. Nageshwar Bhuian.
55. Buboo Mia.
56. Satindra Pd.
57. Umesh Pd. Singh.
58. Eatto Bhuian.
59. Shiboo Bhuian.
60. Bhula Ram.
61. Sugia Oraon.
62. Dukhi Munda.
63. Chhotoo Mahto.
64. Puran Munda.
65. Bela Manjhi.

66. Ram Kishun.
67. Kala Oraon.
68. Ram Dalkhal.
69. Prakash.
70. Majbool Mian.
71. Charnu Agaria.
72. Bita Mahto.
73. Heerva Karmali.
74. Asgar Ali.
75. Vijay Oraon.
76. Karva Oraon.
77. Dukhan Ram.

The case of the workman is that 77 concerned workmen named in the annexure to the schedule of the order of reference are working as permanent workmen since long in Kedla Underground Project of CCI. They were authorised by the management to work in different time rated jobs from the date mentioned in the annexure to the W.S. of the workmen and since then they are continuously working in the designations as shown in their annexure to the W.S. They have all put in more than 190/240 days attendance each year in the respective jobs mentioned in their annexure to the W.S. The concerned workmen are, therefore, entitled to be regularised in the respective jobs mentioned in the enclosed annexure to their W.S. with proper category and pay as per job with retrospective effect. The concerned workmen represented before the management several times for their regularisation and proper category of wages but without any effect. The local management is biased against the concerned workmen because of their trade union activities and are not regularising the concerned workmen with a motive to victimise them. The union of the workmen raised an industrial dispute before the ALC(C), Dhanbad which ended in failure and thereafter the present reference has been made to this Tribunal for adjudication. The action of the management in denying regularisation and proper category of wages to the concerned workmen is illegal, arbitrary, against the provision of standing order and the policy decision of the management. On the above facts it is prayed that an Award be passed regularising the concerned workmen in their proper category as shown in annexure to the W.S. with all consequential benefits retrospectively.

The case of the management is that the reference is bad in law and is liable to be struck down in view of the fact that the case of the 75 out of the 77 concerned workmen are covered by a settlement arrived at between the management and the workmen before the ALC(C) Hazaribagh. According to the terms of the said settlement (1) the management agreed to make payment of arrears to 75 workmen for the period from 19-4-82, (2) the union agreed not to claim the wages of the earlier period prior to 19-4-82 and (3) the parties were to submit implementation report of the settlement to the ALC(C) Hazaribagh by 15-8-84 failing which it was to be presumed that the settlement has been implemented. The management have fully implemented the aforesaid settlement and therefore the present reference is barred. The only extra persons not covered by the said settlements are Sl. No. 76 Shri Karva Oraon and Sl. No. 77 Dukhan Ram and they are not such worker on the roll of the management.

The union of the workmen raised an industrial dispute before the ALC(C) Hazaribagh vide letter dated 26-3-84 claiming that the first 75 workers covered by the annexure to the present reference order were working in higher categories and that they should be paid the difference of wages. By further letter dated 8-6-84 addressed to the ALC(C) Hazaribagh the sponsoring union furnished the names of the workmen concerned in which in some cases the date from which the concerned workmen were stated to be working in higher categories was indicated but in other cases no date was given. In implementing the settlement arrived at dated 4-7-84 referred to above, the management paid the difference of wages either from 19-4-82 or from the subsequent date from which the concerned workmen worked in the higher category. By another letter dated 26-3-84 the

union of the workmen (B.C.K. Union) raised another dispute that Shri Dhirtu Oraon and 90 other workers were only being paid Cat-I wages for a long time and that they should be regularised in higher categories and should be given the arrear increments. The union further did not furnish the list of workers and the conciliation proceeding failed on 30-5-84 but it was subsequently stated by the union that a settlement dated 4-7-84 had been reached between the parties during the course of conciliation proceeding between the management and the sponsoring union. Even then the ALC(C) Hazaribagh submitted a failure report on 25-12-84 on the basis of which the present reference has been made.

The CC. Ltd. is a public sector undertaking in the central spheres and the Central Government imposed restriction on creation of additional posts which have been extended to the Central public sector undertaking including CCL. On account of this wherever it became necessary for the management to take work of higher category from the workers it pays difference of wages between the higher and the lower categories and the workers concerned will in due course be regularised in the higher post subject to completion of the usual formalities after the posts have been created. In fact, on creation of some additional posts the concerned workmen of Sl. No. 1 to 12, 16, 17 to 25, 27, 28, 33 to 37, 39 to 41, 43, 50, 52 to 55, 57, 58, 60 to 62, 64, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75 and 77 of the annexure to the schedule of the order of reference have already been regularised in their respective category with effect from 1-1-85, long before the present reference order was issued. In view of the settlement dated 4-7-84 and the fact that 50 of the concerned workmen have already been regularised from 1-1-85 and the others are being paid difference of wages as per the settlement in question, which is still in force, the question of the management justifying the action of denying the regularisation and not giving proper category to the concerned workmen for years together does not arise. The management denies that the concerned persons are working in different categories other than their categories in which they were actually placed by the management. In view of the above facts it is prayed on behalf of the management that the Award be passed in their favour.

The point for consideration is whether the concerned workmen are entitled to be regularised in the proper categories and paid backwages as claimed by them with retrospective effect.

The management examined one witness in support of their case. The workmen did not examine any witness. The documents of the management have been marked Ext. M-1 to M-13 and the documents of the workmen are marked Ext. W-1 to W-3.

Admittedly, there was a settlement between the sponsoring union representing the concerned 75 workmen vide Ext. M-3 dated 4-7-84. MW-1 is a Mining Engineer working in Kedla U/G. Project since 1980. He has stated that vide Ext. M-1 Shri Dhaniram Manjhi of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union Kedla U/G. Project, CCL raised the dispute before the ALC(C), Hazaribagh. Ext. M-2 is a letter dated 6-4-84 by the ALC(C) Hazaribagh to the Project Officer Kedla Underground Project CCL regarding payment of difference of wages to Dhirtu Oraon and 56 other employees of Kedla Underground Project and a copy of the statement of demand of the union dated 26-3-84 (Ext. M-1) was sent to the Project Officer for conciliation. MW-1 has stated that Ext. M-3 is the memorandum of settlement arrived at before the ALC(C) Hazaribagh on 4-7-84 which is signed by the representatives of the management and the union. He has stated that the said settlement Ext. M-3 was implemented by the management. The terms of settlement in Ext. M-3 will show that the management had agreed to make payment of arrears to 75 workmen for the period from 19-4-82 and that the union had agreed not to claim the wages for the period prior to 19-4-82. Ext. M-4 is the pay sheet by which the arrears of wages were paid to the concerned workmen in accordance with the settlement arrived at between the parties for the period 19-4-82 to the year 1984. Ext. M-4 there-

fore will show that the difference of wages for the period 19-4-82 to 1-9-84 was paid to the concerned workmen in accordance with the terms of settlement Ext. M-3. MW-1 has stated that after payment of the arrears the concerned workmen were paid the difference of wage per month till they were regularised. I may mention here to make it more explicit that the 75 workmen in connection with Ext. M-3 were the concerned workmen from Sl. No. 1 to Sl. No. 75 of the annexure to the schedule of order of present reference. It will thus be clear that a settlement was arrived at between the management and the union of the concerned workmen in presence of the ALC(C) Hazaribagh and that in accordance with terms of settlement the difference of wages was paid to the concerned workmen for the period 19-4-82 to 1984 and that the union of the concerned workmen themselves had agreed that they would not claim the wages for the period prior to 19-4-82. The workmen have adduced no evidence to show that the arrears of the difference of wages was not paid to the concerned workmen in respect of the work which they were doing and accordingly there can now be no question of payment arrear difference of wages for the period from 19-4-82 or prior to it.

It is the case of the management that many of the concerned workmen have been regularised and are getting the wages of their proper category. In cross-examination MW-1 has stated that all the concerned workmen have not yet been regularised. He has stated that a separate list of concerned workmen regularised is given in the statement Ext. M-11. He has further stated that when a workman works in higher category for one year and if posts are available he is regularised in the job in which he is working. Ext. M-11 further shows the payment of difference of wages which some of the concerned workmen were getting prior to their regularisation Ext. M-9 dated 31-5-85 is an office order which shows that the workmen working in piece-rated and time rated jobs were regularised against the posts mentioned against their names. Ext. M-10 is another office order dated 31-6-85 showing regularisation of piece-rated and time rated workers against the posts mentioned against their names. Ext. M-12 will further show that the 5 concerned workmen named in it were regularised. Ext. M-11 is a statement prepared by the management showing the position of regularisation of the concerned workmen. From the above exts. which has not been denied by the workmen it will appear that Sl. No. 1 to 10, 12, 13, 16, 19 to 28, 31 to 37, 39 to 43, 47, 49, to 54, 57, 60, 61, 68, 70, 72 and 77 were all regularised vide Ext. M-9 and M-10 and M-12.

Ext. M-13 dated 29-8-89/5-989 is an office order to show that the piece rated employees who were regularised in a higher category/grade but the effective date from which they were to be regularised and their date of joining were not communicated and were under examination was now clear as to their effective date from which they shall be regularised and their date of joining in the category/grade are shown against their names. It will appear from this Ext. M13 that subsequently Sl. No. 14, 18, 29, 44, 45, 46, 55, 56, 62, 63, 66, 67, 71, 73, 74 and 75 of the annexure to the schedule of the order of reference we were regularised with effect from 1-1-85.

Now taking the list of the concerned workmen who had been regularised vide different exts as discussed above it will appear that now only 12 concerned workmen at Sl. No. 11, 15, 17, 30, 38, 48, 58, 59, 64, 65, 69, 76 of the annexure to the schedule of reference have not yet been regularised and the rest of the concerned workmen have already been regularised. Out of the said 12 concerned workmen who have not been regularised Sl. No. 30 is still working as piece rated and as such there is no question of his regularisation in the time rated job. Sl. Nos. 11, 30, 38 and 76 are getting higher piece rated wages and as such there was no question of payment of difference of wages in the time rated jobs. There is some difference in the names of some of the concerned workmen and the management in the W.S. had given their correct name and as such there is no dispute that they are not the concerned workmen in the case. Thus it will appear that except Sl. No. 30 of the annexure the 11 concerned workmen who have not yet been regularised

ed now deserve to be regularised as they have been working in time rated jobs since many years. As all the concerned workmen above already been regularised there is no question as to why these concerned workmen also should not be regularised in the post and the job which is being performed by them in time rated jobs. The learned representative of the workmen also feels that as all the concerned workmen except 11 have been regularised, the union has no grievance in respect of the concerned workmen who have already been regularised but they submit that the remaining 11 concerned workmen (leaving aside Sl. No. 30 who is still working as piece rated) should be regularised. The learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the management has submitted that in view of the fact that all other concerned workmen have been regularised, the Tribunal may in its discretion direct the management to regularise the 11 concerned workmen also as it is difficult to differentiate their case from the rest of the concerned workmen.

In view of the discussions made above I hold that all the concerned workmen except 12 have already been regularised with effect from 1985 and there is no question of their regularisation in the time rated jobs. I have also come to the conclusion that the difference of wages of the category in which the concerned workmen were working had already been paid to them and as such there is no question of payment of difference of wages to them. The management is directed to regularise Sl. No. 11, 15, 17, 38, 48, 58, 59, 64, 65, 69, 76 with effect from 1-1-85 as in the case of others. As Sl. No. 11, 38 and 76 are already getting higher piece-rated wages than the time rated job which they are performing and the other 8 workmen whose Sl. No. have been stated above have already received the difference of wages, there is no question of payment of difference of wages to them. The management has only to regularise the concerned 11 workmen whose Sl. Nos. of the annexure to the schedule of reference have been stated above within one month of the publication of this Award in the Gazette of India.

The Award is passed accordingly.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-24012(104)/84-D.IV(B)/IR(Coal-I)]

का. प्र. 3226.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अधिनियम में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. की मुदिह कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कामदारों के बीच, अतः केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (मं. 2), धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है।

S.O. 3226.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mudidih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. and their workmen.

**ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD
PRESENT**

Shri I. N. Sinha,
Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 2 of 1988.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of West Mudidih Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : Shri Arjun Singh, Secretary, Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat.

On behalf of the employers : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar. **INDUSTRY :** Coal.

Dated. Dhanbad, the 17th October, 1989.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)-(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012(109)/87-D.III(A), dated, the 7th December, 1987.

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Union Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat (HMS) Dhanbad that the dependent of late Mantia Kamin, Casual Wagon Loader of West Mudidih Colliery of Katras Area No. IV of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited be offered employment under clause 9.4.2 of NCWA-III is justified? If yes to what relief is the workman entitled?"

In this case both the parties did not file their respective W.S. but subsequently appeared before me and filed a petition of compromise under their signature. I heard them on the said petition of compromise and I do find that the terms contained therein are fair, proper and beneficial to both of them. Accordingly I accept the same and pass an Award in terms of the petition of compromise which forms part of the Award as annexure.

**ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
NO. 2 AT DHANBAD.**

Ref. No. L-20012(109)/87-D.III(A)
RG/88.

dated 7-12-1987.

Employers in relation to the management of West Mudidih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.L. and its workmen.

PETITION OF COMPROMISE

The humble petition on behalf of the parties to the above reference most respectfully sheweth—

That without prejudice to the respective contention of the parties, the dispute amicably settled between the parties on the following terms.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (a) That Shri Omprakash Nonia, dependent brother of deceased female employee Mantia Beldarin, casual wagon loader of West Mudidih Colliery will be given employment as badli Miner/Loader after he reports for his duty alongwith certificate and documents mentioned herein after within 30 days from the date of this settlement.
 - (b) That the said dependent brother should be below 35 years of age and should be medically fit to work as Miner/Loader. He shall be medically examined by the Area Medical Board and if found fit he shall be provided employment as badli Miner/Loader.
 - (c) The said dependent brother will submit attestation form duly certified by the Gazetted Officer of Central/State Govt. or MP or MLA belonging to the constituency where candidate or his parent guardian is originally residing or Sub-Divisional Magistrates/Officers or Tahsildars or Naib/Dy. Tahsildars authorised to exercise Magisterial powers or Principal/Head Master of the recognised School/College/Institution where the candidates studied last or Block Development Officer & Mukhiya of Gram Panchayat together with an affidavit indicating that he is the real dependent brother of Mantia Beldarin on whose behalf the dispute has been raised.
 - (d) That he will submit a certificate from the Secretary of the Union raising the present dispute certifying that he is the dependent brother of Late Mantia Beldarin on whose behalf the present dispute has been raised.
 - (e) That in case it will be found that the said person made false declaration on the certificate regarding his identity, the services of the said person will stand automatically terminated.
2. That in view of the settlement, there remains nothing to be adjudicated.
- It is, therefore, humbly prayed that honourable Tribunal will graciously be pleased to pass the Award in terms of settlement in favour of the employer.
- For the Workman.
1. Sr. Arjun Singh,
Secretary, KIMP.
 2. Shri Omprakash Nonia,
For management.
 1. (A. K. Srivastava)
General Manager,
Katras Area.
 2. (R. Mohan),
Dy. Chief Personnel Manager,
Katras Area.
 3. (P. Jha),
Dy. Personnel Manager,
Katras Area.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(100)/87-D.III(A)] (R. Coal-I)]
K. J. DYVA PRASAD, Desk Officer

